

the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the benefit of the RECORD, let me state that it is my understanding that the Senate is now in executive session, and that the pending business is the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss (colonel, Medical Corps), assistant to the Surgeon General, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Surgeon General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Maj. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk, United States Army, whose term of office expires May 31, 1947.

Col. George Ellis Armstrong (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, United States Army, nominated for appointment as the Surgeon General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who takest up the isles of the sea and weighest the mountains in scales and the hills in the balance, our inmost instincts reach toward Thee. O Divine Galilean, who lived the only earthly life of supreme good ever known, teach us Thy secret that we may achieve the ends of our being without haste, tumult, or worry. Bless us today with tranquil minds that point to victory over the problems of our beloved country. These days, these hours, measure our wisdom, our sense of duty and sympathy, and even our lives.

Blessed Lord, take us and shield us, and if unworthy rebuke us; if our aims are low, challenge us and spare us from the regretful way that ends in failure. O hear us for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 938. An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) entitled "An act to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes."

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site—commonly known as the base 6 property—which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes," as amended (Public Law No. 655, 79th Cong.; 60 Stat. 901), is hereby amended by striking out "6 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 months."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials and a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from Mr. Palmer, of General Cable Corp., on the subject Cooperation of Industry in Lowering Prices.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram sent him by the Oregon Department of the American Legion, and also by the Oregon

Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A SCAPEGOAT FOR HIGH PRICES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, at a recent news conference, and also at the AP meeting in New York on Monday, President Truman blamed present high prices upon American business and industry. He said the responsibility for price reduction rests solely upon business. He stated, in effect, "American business must either get prices down or wages will go up."

In making that statement, the President chose to ignore entirely the following facts, not one of which is under the control of business:

First. The Federal Government, through its farm-price-support program, maintains high food prices, and high food prices account for 70 percent of the rise in living costs.

Second. The Federal Government, through its enormous purchases for export of scarce items, accentuates those scarcities, thereby forcing prices still higher.

Third. The Federal Government still retains control over many items that enter into the cost of living.

Fourth. Mr. Truman himself, early in 1946, set the pattern for spiraling Nation-wide wage increases. His action was based upon an erroneous report from the Department of Commerce, headed by Henry Wallace—a report that said a 20-percent raise in wages could be granted without a rise in prices.

Fifth. The high cost of Government—\$37,500,000,000 as against \$8,000,000,000 in prewar years—is an important factor in the high cost of living.

Every economist agrees that scarcities, coupled with high wages, produce high prices. When the President made his statement he chose to ignore this well-known economic fact and the five causes listed above. That proves that he is either uninformed concerning the factors responsible for the present high level of prices or he prefers for political reasons to ignore these factors and do as his predecessor did—make a scapegoat out of American business and industry by loading the administration's sins upon them.

We all want a reduction in prices. We welcome the reductions that business leaders have already made, and are still making. We are ready to commend any and every effort that the administration may make in that direction. But we cannot refrain from pointing out at this time that President Truman and the New Deal administration, having jacked prices up to their present high level—by creating scarcities and by greatly increasing the purchasing power of the people—must now assume a large part of the responsibility for bringing about a

reduction in our present-day inflated prices. President Truman cannot escape this responsibility by making a scapegoat of American business and industry.

THE BRINGING OF ILLEGITIMATE NEGRO CHILDREN INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the press correctly quotes me this morning as being unalterably opposed to bringing to this country a lot of illegitimate half-breed Negro children from England. They are the offsprings of the scum of the British Isles. I said that probably they would inherit the vices of both races and the virtues of neither.

I am backed up in my position by one of the leading Negro bishops of the South, Bishop E. J. Cain, of Arkansas. He seems to represent the views of the real Negroes of this country.

He said that "the intelligent Negroes of America" will oppose the proposal to bring from Great Britain to the United States approximately 10,000 children whose fathers were alleged to be American Negro soldiers.

He said:

The intelligent Negroes of America are trying to discourage the mongrel in our race.

In other words, they are trying to discourage mongrelization; they are trying to build up their own people.

He said:

We couldn't be proud of these children, and neither could the white race.

I continue to receive letters to the effect that Mrs. Roosevelt advocates bringing them over here. Now, I hope that is a mistake, for it would be one of the worst blunders she could possibly make.

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great women of all times is the wife of the former President of the United States. You may not always agree with what she says. I think no one can doubt her sincerity, her great courage, and her great love for humanity. We hear much these days about democracy, and we are willing to invest hundreds of millions of dollars, even the lives of our sons, to promote democracy in the world. Democracy rests on the religious concept of the dignity and the worth of the individual, and the recognition of God. God does not draw boundaries; at least, not the God I learned to worship in my church. He does not draw boundaries any place on earth, and I say that Elea-

nor Roosevelt, and those like her who have walked down through history with light around their heads are the true disciples of Jesus Christ and the true practicing Christians on this earth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition from the citizens of Gering, Nebr.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Angell	Elsaesser	McGarvey
Barden	Fallon	Macy
Battle	Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland	Fuller	Meyer
Bonner	Fulton	Miller, Md.
Brooks	Gallagher	Mitchell
Brown, Ohio	Gary	Morrison
Buckley	Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Gifford	O'Toole
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall	Patman
Celler	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Chapman	Holifield	Poage
Clark	Horan	Powell
Clements	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Clippinger	Jenison	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Short
Cooley	Johnson, Ind.	Snyder
Coudert	Johnson, Okla.	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Tex.	Towe
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Wash.	Trimble
Dingell	Lucas	West
Domenegeaux	McDonough	
Ellsworth	McDowell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. EBERHARTER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the National Republican Committee by Mr. HALLECK on last Monday at Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 194, Rept. No. 293), which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the appropriation and language contained in the bill, on page 50, lines 13 to 21, inclusive, and on page 81, lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with the closing up of UNRRA the United Nations took into consideration the problem of how to finish up the task of caring for starving people in the devastated areas of Europe and perhaps of China. It was decided that this would be a unilateral performance, and our share would be 57 percent instead of 72 percent. The amount allotted to the United States of America of the \$610,000,000 is \$350,000,000, provided for in this bill.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I wish to call attention to a very troublesome situation.

The psychology in the House at the present is very simple. The Republicans are in the majority. We still have a Democratic administration in the executive branch. When anything comes up from the executive department, or any proposal comes up for legislation of a domestic nature, you Republicans are perfectly free to raise hell with the administration, and you do.

But in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it is different. We in that committee represent all the people regardless of political labels. We speak to all the world. Whoever is Chief Executive is our President, and so far as the world knows, his is our administration until in the providence of God the people make a change. It so happens that in view of the conditions of the world, our committee is going to bring before the House many requests for money. This first one is for \$350,000,000. Next week it will be \$400,000,000. After that it will be \$72,000,000, and beyond that I do not dare to prophesy, but I am afraid we will be asking for money almost continuously.

Now, do not blame it on our committee. Do not blame it on anybody except upon the conditions in the world. Let us hope and pray that we can face this demand upon our resources, spiritual and material, with an open mind.

I call attention to another situation that we have to deal with in our committee. We have not at the present any knowledge of the resources of this Nation which may safely be drawn upon now and in the future for the assistance of mankind. I feel the time is here when we ought to have a complete and authoritative and intelligent study made of the financial resources and conditions of this Nation of ours so that we can base our appeal for help for the rest of the world upon reality rather than upon mere sentiment.

In the second place, we have as yet no permanent policy announced to us by the executive branch of the Government as to our relationship to the devastated world. In my judgment, we need an administration of relief which will be intelligent, if possible, under present world conditions, and which will be representative of all the people of this country.

With that background, I call attention to the fact that the preparation of this bill took 12 very exhaustive hearings. I may say that it is the reasoned result of those hearings and those deliberations that your committee brings to you. I understand that it is proposed to rewrite this bill on the floor of the House. I congratulate the membership of the House who have had access to more information than the committee has been able to find. I have no doubt that with your wide information you will be able to write a much better bill, and I hope you have a good time doing it. As far as the committee is concerned, I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], whom I hold in high esteem, yesterday proposed six amendments. There will be a great flock of others, legitimate and illegitimate, presented here. When we are through, it will amount to a vote of no confidence as far as the Committee on Foreign Affairs is concerned. If you go to that length, it will, of course, be my very pleasant duty to call the committee together and ask them when they wish to disband. We will now proceed to the autopsy.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman yields the floor, will he be kind enough to yield to me to propound a question?

Mr. EATON. I will be very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. COX. My objection to the resolution, if I have objection, grows out of the fear that it is proposed that we be further used to fulfill obligations that rest more directly and more immediately upon Russia. I note the countries in which you propose to extend some part of this \$350,000,000, and from that list I observe that the greater part of the fund will be expended in countries that are now overrun and under the domination and control of Russia. What provision is there in the resolution, what is proposed shall be done by way of making known to the recipients of this fund

that it is being provided by the United States?

It is my conviction, and it is a solemn conviction, that we have permitted ourselves to be used pretty liberally by Russia in providing funds, the benefit of which has gone to Russia and not to the countries intended. Now, are we traveling at cross purposes when we set up this fund?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say for myself that I recognize with deep distress the fact that mankind is face to face with the most profound and far-reaching decision in its history. That decision is between the establishment of a world civilization based upon freedom, which is the American way, or upon slavery, which is the Russian way. The ideology of communism is our mortal enemy everywhere, all the time. Personally, I am averse to helping our enemies, and strong for helping our friends. But we have been sound asleep. We have been appeasing Russia; gently patting this communistic tiger and saying, "Poor pussy," while the communistic ideology has been taking possession of these stricken European countries and penetrating every other country in the world.

How are we going to assist these starving men, women, and children in a desolation unequalled in the history of the world, and avoid apparently helping a communistic country in some way? Let me read certain reservations:

No relief assistance can be provided to the people of any country unless and until the government of that country gives assurances satisfactory to the President that:

1. There will be no discrimination in the distribution of relief supplies.
2. There will be complete freedom of press and radio of the United States to observe and report on relief activities.
3. Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program.
4. Such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, steps to reduce its relief needs and provide for its own future reconstruction.
5. Upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning production and use which would affect its relief needs.
6. Representatives of the United States Government will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the relief supplies.

In addition to that, we have provided that the Congress of the United States can cancel this program at any time it sees fit.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Further answering the gentleman from Georgia, is it not a fact that in this legislation we carefully stayed away from enumerating any specific amount to go to any particular country. The idea is that if the Administration handling these funds in the different countries finds that in a particular country the food or material is not going to the people who are deserving, the administrators can automatically shut off the relief. It is a dif-

ferent proposition, is it not, than UNRRA? UNRRA was an international proposition. This is a proposition where the Government of the United States controls every penny it has appropriated for this purpose and it cannot go to any other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman take a little more time?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such additional time as I may need to satisfy this passion for information.

If the Members will read sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill they will find an answer to most of their questions.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I say first that if we had had a little more passion for information when we passed the original UNRRA bill maybe we would now have a little more information.

Mr. EATON. I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is all right. Witnesses before one of my subcommittees testified that in some of these countries where UNRRA relief was distributed Russia told the people that UNRRA was the name of a town in Russia and that the relief came from that town Unrra in Russia. Will this bill, if passed, enable the administrator of the funds to stop that sort of thing?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In other words, can that be repeated by Russia again? Can they go into a country and use similar methods and tactics?

Mr. EATON. My answer is that nothing short of divine intervention can keep communism from lying; that is its foundation.

Mr. COLMER. But if they do lie we can stop them from going to those countries.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will look at the top of page 4 he will find this provision that must apply:

Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

The prevention of the abuse about which the gentleman is talking is specifically provided in this bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, is this not the situation: Every dollar of

this money is in the hands of the President of the United States. Is not that correct?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. And the President of the United States does not have to allow a single dollar to any country or any group unless in his considered judgment that country or that group needs it and will use it to the best advantage of the starving people in devastated areas.

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee knows, I wish to bring this matter to a focus and an issue in the House. It is therefore my purpose at the proper time to offer an amendment to bring this issue up for discussion and decision: Whether it is the will of this Congress that any of this money shall go into either the Soviet Republic or those countries dominated by the Soviet Republic.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. On that, there may be Soviet-dominated governments in the world for the moment, where the people are not Soviets, but would like to shed Soviet rule; but they are hungry people just the same as they are in other sections of the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] use some of his time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], to state that the committee had not been presented with any program for the allocation or the spending of this authorized amount of \$350,000,000.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not hear the gentleman say that. I tried to make it clear that when Mr. Clayton came before the committee he did not want to have in this bill anything specific which would compel the committee or the administrator of these funds to give to any certain country any specific amount. Now, let us be reasonable about this thing. If we provide in this bill a certain number of dollars for Italy, Greece, or some other country, then the people of those different countries will expect that amount of money whether they conform to the rules and regulations laid down by the President, who is administering these funds. In this bill we provide the rules and regulations they must conform to and the President of the United States has full control. A gentleman referred

to UNRRA, but that has nothing to do with this. This is a different kind of administration. It is a unilateral administration. If they do not conform to the rules and regulations laid down by the United States Government then we can automatically, without any notice at all, shut them off from any further relief.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for raising that question is this: Hitherto in making appropriations under authorizations, and that was true in the appropriations which were recently reported by the Deficiency Committee making \$300,000,000 additional available for relief in the occupied countries, it has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee to ask those presenting the estimates for the amount of money that they propose to spend on given items and the country or countries in which they propose to spend it. I should like to know for the RECORD whether or not there is anything in this legislation which proposes that if this money is authorized, when the time comes for appropriations it must be appropriated purely as a blank check, or whether the Appropriations Committee will be permitted and expected at that time to get a detailed program of the money that is to be appropriated for what and where and to determine the amounts in any given bill.

Mr. BLOOM. That is a very important question, but I am going to hand it right back and put it in your lap. This is merely an authorization. When the administration comes in and asks for further funds, the Appropriations Committee has full control. It has all the evidence. It can do anything it wants. But remember that there are so many different branches and many different ramifications to these different things we have in here. A resolution may be offered covering a children's fund. This does not say anything about that. I am for it. I think it is a wonderful thing. But we have people here starving and we have to do everything we possibly can now. They are starving over there and we cannot wait until the ideas of all the people in the world are presented. If we do, there will not be any people to feed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the gentleman's answer is that if this authorization is passed by the Congress and approved, when the matter of appropriating funds comes up the gentleman will expect the Appropriations Committee to do its customary duty.

Mr. BLOOM. They can do whatever they want, certainly. It is all in their hands.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. For a question; yes.

Mr. COX. Let me preface it with just this brief statement. If we mean what we say about stopping Russia and intend to make the first move in that direction by extending aid to Greece and Turkey, then should we not accept the amendment which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] states he will offer, that no part of this fund should be expended in any country dominated by Russia?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do think this is a tremendously serious matter, so let me repeat: Where the Government of a country might be under Communist domination, or where infiltration of communism into the government has taken place, are we going to refuse to feed the starving people of these devastated war-stricken countries and permanently drive them into the arms of communism? I think we ought to think of that for a moment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better go on with the debate. I am sorry I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to throw a little light on this subject, if I can. To start with, I know all you ladies and gentlemen are in favor of relieving suffering throughout the world. I believe that most all Americans are. You know, you cannot find two more typical Americans in this country, I think, than Harry Truman and Herbert Hoover. Both of these great men addressed the Congress; one of them through the committee and one directly to the Congress, endorsing the proposals of this bill. It is true that Mr. Hoover made a few other suggestions as to how we should do the thing sought to be done here. If the Members of the House will just get this clearly in their minds—and I am speaking particularly to the gentleman from Georgia who has just asked the question about Soviet domination and Soviet use of the funds proposed here—I want to assure them that the very thing we are trying to do in this bill is to get away from the thing that the gentleman from Georgia is afraid of. Through this bill, the Russian Government will not be able to get its claws on these relief supplies, directly, or indirectly, through some other government in Europe favorable to the communistic theory.

Heretofore this Congress has gone along with the other nations of the earth to provide relief funds through UNRRA. We have spent about \$2,500,000,000 as a contribution to that fund. The whole relief fund used up, or committed, to this time I think is about \$3,500,000,000.

As a matter of fact, we have contributed 72 percent of that entire fund for world relief to this date. In addition to that, we have turned our funds over to an international organization, and in some cases we have been disappointed in the methods of distribution and the results.

This bill speaks for itself. By its provisions, somewhere, sometime, relief to these countries has got to come to an end. It is not envisioned in this bill that more than \$610,000,000 from all sources will be used for relief. The United States is to provide \$350,000,000, which sum comes to 10 percent of our original contribution since the world relief program started 2 years ago, so you can see we are gradually tapering off, you can see

we are gradually getting away from this load. But we paid 72 percent of the total amount in UNRRA used for relief. In this bill we do not propose to pay proportionately as much; we propose to pay 57 percent of the \$610,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. That is the amount that was allocated by the Committee of the United Nations. This is all regulated by the one committee that was formed by the United Nations, and the \$610,000,000 was the amount they set.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is substantially correct, and I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to it.

We are not only cutting down the relief contribution by this country but we are also cutting down our proportionate share of world relief contributions in this bill. But the most important thing about this bill is that it blazes a new American policy in the field of international relief. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia, and every other Member here, we are determined through this bill that this relief money that will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America will go to no country or people hopelessly under Communist domination. How can we assure that? Because the United States keeps control of its own money, because we can say tomorrow, "We do not like the way you are doing in your country, and we will cut it off."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman certain that he is correct in that statement, in view of the fact that the very resolution itself says that part of this fund shall be expended in Poland, in Hungary, and in other countries that are completely dominated by Russia?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia is incorrect. It is not provided in this bill that any part of this fund will be used in any particular country. It is advisedly left out of the bill.

Mr. COX. Why name the countries in which it is contemplated that a part of the fund will be expended?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia knows that there is a reasonable demand in this Congress to give some information about where this money is going, but it is unwise, I say to the Congress, to make it compulsory that this money go to any particular country.

Mr. COX. In view of the gentleman's statement, will he permit me to propose this question?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman be willing that 1 penny of this fund be expended in Yugoslavia, in Poland, or in any other countries that are dominated by Russia? Does he have the slightest doubt in his mind that if a penny of it were to go into those countries it would be controlled by the local government?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not be willing for one thin dime of this money to be spent in Yugoslavia, and not a dime of it will be spent there, though it is not

guaranteed in the bill. Some of this money will probably be spent in Poland, for well-known reasons.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to test out the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed a little further, I shall then be glad to answer any questions.

It is suggested that this money will be used in Hungary, Poland, Austria, Italy, Greece, and China. Those are the countries that are suggested. It is not made mandatory in the bill.

We know that \$610,000,000 will be a drop in the bucket to meet all relief needs in every country, but it seems the best we can do for this year. We know we cannot feed all the people of the world and we know we cannot abolish misery from the face of the earth. But following the leadership of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman, we must do what we can in a Christian way to bring this suffering to a minimum. The testimony throughout the hearings was that \$610,000,000 is a minimum.

So far as Italy is concerned, we have a peace treaty with that country and there is much misery and want there. So far as Yugoslavia is concerned, we know that Tito is under the domination of Stalin, and none of this money is intended to go there. So far as Greece is concerned, we know that human misery and suffering there is at a maximum.

So far as Austria is concerned, there is a real relief problem there. Austria is divided into zones. France, Russia, the United States, and Great Britain each control a zone there. Reliable reports are that there is not only starvation there, but that an ideological conflict is also going on.

General Marshall is in Moscow right now trying to consummate an Austrian peace treaty but has not been able to succeed in doing so. The Russians are hoping we will get worn out and move out of there and leave these people disillusioned. Right now there is a battle going on for freedom in Austria. There is Hungary, the only nation that while suffering under the heels of Russian troops voted for a democratic form of government and turned the Russian proposition down cold.

My friends, it will not be long before the question of aid for Greece and Turkey comes up in the House. Do not forget for 1 minute that the proposal now pending is related to that question. If we help Greece and Turkey, do not forget that we must also help other sections there where the people cannot speak for fear of being punished. We must give them hope. We must show them that we have not forgotten them in their misery.

We are going to see that this money is spent under American supervision. That is one thing we could not do under UNRRA. We are going in there with this money and we are going to say to those governments, "This is the way you must administer this relief." And if they do not do as we say they should do, then we have the greatest weapon in the world

to handle a situation like that, all we have need to say is, "This money stops today."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what other countries are going in with us on this proposition?

Mr. RICHARDS. In reply to the gentleman, may I say we are somewhat in the same position here as we were in the case of UNRRA. In the case of UNRRA, other countries agreed to pay proportionate shares, most all did so. We are not only going to make agreements with recipient countries as to how we are going to do the job, and determine other conditions upon which we will give this relief, but we are also going to try to make agreements with contributing countries, as to how much they will contribute. England has already promised to put up \$40,000,000 for Austria. Canada has already given assurance that she will do her rightful part in this deal. Canada usually does. I think we have reasonable grounds to expect that the nations to the south of us and the other nations that have not suffered like Europe has will do their part. But if they do not, we still have control of this fund to say where it will go, what it will be used for, and how long this program will continue.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I would like the gentleman to explain how, after we enact this legislation, we will then have control of where the money will be spent and how much will be spent. Who is going to control it?

Mr. RICHARDS. For the very reason that we do not state in the bill where it will go and how much will go to a certain place. If the gentleman will permit, elasticity is a supreme requirement in a thing like this. For that degree of control we should have, you must have a great deal of discretionary power in the distributing agency.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. But we give authorization for \$350,000,000 to be spent by the State Department.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right; or by the President.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. But once the Congress passes this bill, we have no control.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, there is control.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Do the rules require Members to address the Chair in order to get permission to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. The rules do so require.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will answer that a little further. I do not know how you could administer legislation like this without discretionary power. We know from our constitutional set-up that if you give discretionary power with respect to making agreements with foreign countries, it has to be in the President or the State Department. I understand amendments will be offered to try to place this thing in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. But it would not work that way.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from New York did not address the Chair.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York did address the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York as having addressed the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom].

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that this legislation specifically provides that the Congress can, by concurrent resolution, stop the whole thing right away, as well as the President? So that you have two checks?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think that is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just recently I noticed in the local papers a story about children out in the receiving home, several hundred of them. This morning there is an editorial in the News about a 14-year-old boy confined out there with the insane and with people who have contagious diseases. Can any of that money be used for relief of the Washington children?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; I do not think so. I think Washington people and other people around here will take care of that. We will always have a case like that, but we have less suffering in the United States than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] just asked where the other 43 percent of this \$610,000,000 was coming from. I was very much interested in having that information given. I did not understand the gentleman to mention but \$50,000,000 from England and an indefinite promise from Canada. Could the gentleman answer specifically the question that the gentleman from Louisiana asked?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say this: The method of raising this fund was suggested by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The nations all joined in voting for this method, and we are hoping to get the money. To be honest with this House, we cannot guarantee that we will get that part of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has said that in the agreement with the representatives of the United Nations there was \$610,000,000 that would be necessary to complete this program.

Mr. RICHARDS. Let me say right there, it was not an agreement with the United Nations. It was at the suggestion of the General Assembly of the United Nations that this method be used.

Mr. HARRIS. A general understanding then?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And we are providing \$350,000,000?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; 57 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. If the other member nations do not provide the additional \$260,000,000, then will the United States be called upon to supply that difference?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; certainly not.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Following the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis], I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to my belief that he erred in stating that the other countries did not come forth with their portion of UNRRA. My recollection of the testimony is that every one of them did, with perhaps one minor exception.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. JARMAN. Ninety-nine percent of them.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think there were two small exceptions, involving about \$15,000,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. How much is being contributed to this fund by that other great world power, Russia?

Mr. RICHARDS. None; and none of this fund goes to Russia. Under UNRRA we mistakenly went into Russia and gave relief to Russians. But through this new method we are deciding that Russia had better do some relieving herself of her own Ukraine White Russian people, and the same applies to Yugoslavia, where Tito rules. We are intimating to Russia here that we are not going into any country, dominated by her, feed the starving there, and then be accused of dollar diplomacy by the hirelings of Stalin. Instead we are going to keep control of the reins over the taxpayers' money spent through this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the great heart of America has always responded to the limit of its ability in answering the call of human suffering. President Truman and former President Hoover reflect the spirit of America in urging that we continue some form of relief to the war-devastated nations. This bill must pass. On the other hand, there can be legitimate discussion as to the terms and provisions and administrative machinery of this bill; and amendments which will be offered, suggestions as to the form of administration, do not in-

jure the bill but may well help the bill to pass.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, because, unfortunately there is a general attitude in the House Chamber that this bill should not be amended.

I agree 100 percent with the gentleman from Ohio. We have the responsibility to aid the suffering people over there, but this bill can be tremendously corrected and strengthened by the adoption of amendments, some of which were offered in the committee and defeated by but one or two votes.

Mr. VORYS. And I am sure amendments will be offered to this bill by those who are devoted friends of the suffering and who want to aid them to the utmost.

But let us get a bird's-eye view of the relief needs of the world. There are about 2,200,000,000 people in the world, and most of them need relief, according to American standards. If we attempted to relieve all of them who need relief we would succeed in prolonging their lives by only a few months and going bankrupt ourselves. And let us remember always that when we impoverish ourselves to the point where we need relief there is going to be no country in the world available to relieve us.

At the hearings on this bill when Mr. Clayton, the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, was before the committee, he was unable to tell us the amount of the relief and assistance the United States has rendered and is planning to render; but Senator BYRD yesterday gave the figures and they are very fully set forth in the RECORD. Since VE-day we have furnished or we plan to furnish relief and assistance to foreign nations in the amount of \$15,970,000,000. We have got to be thinking about the ability of the United States to continue relief and assistance.

Mr. Clayton had no idea as to the number of people who might be involved in this bill. As I figure it out under this bill, in the five nations in Europe to which it applies, there are 93,325,600 people. In China there are 457,835,475 a total under this bill of 551,160,075—half a billion people. If we add Germany and Japan, which are our continuing responsibility, we have 693,894,283 people, for whose relief we are accepting responsibility. We must therefore proceed with care.

Something has been said about UNRRA, that this is to take the place of UNRRA. I was an original supporter of UNRRA on this floor and I wish to call attention to a couple of things: First, UNRRA did a lot of good; second, its failures were for two reasons; first, because of Soviet interference, and second, because of poor administration furnished by this country. We named the head of UNRRA each time. In contemplating this bill remember there will be the same people in the State Department administering it who practically administered UNRRA and supervised

our part of it. They are the people who are going to run this bill. We have just ahead of us IRO, the International Refugee Organization and the children's fund, both of them international organizations. I suggest that we must go forward and finish up with this program, but we better get to making these international organizations work by furnishing good American administration instead of going it alone, as we are in this case.

For these reasons I am going to propose at the proper time that a relief administrator be appointed, to be confirmed by the Senate, to administer this bill, the same sort of amendment that is in the Greek-Turkish loan bill that is on the way here from the Senate.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with the gentleman who preceded him that as the bill is presently written we are fully protected in its administration, that we can cut it off whenever we believe that any of this money would go to countries that are now dominated by Russia?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman agree with the statement that the gentleman made that the bill as written guarantees us against the use of this money in those countries in the administration of the fund?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. The only provision that I want to add is to provide, as was done in the Greek-Turkish loan bill, an administrator to be confirmed by the Senate, so that we will have an administrative business head to it, because the State Department is not set up as an administrative organization, and they admit it.

The criticism will be made: Well, suppose you get into a situation like the Lillenthal confirmation, will there not be a great delay? I want to remind you that the United States Senate has confirmed 12,896 Executive appointments this year up to April 15 and if a good man is proposed for this job there will be no delay.

What are the needs? Where does this relief go? The Foreign Affairs Committee knows the answer, but we do not dare tell you. It is a secret. I have here a secret document furnished us and just for safety, for fear some of you would try to look into it, I have sealed the pages with Scotch tape. I am going to carry out this secrecy policy of the State Department, although it is idiotic and insulting. The secrecy policy is carried on because, as Mr. Clayton said, it might cause embarrassment or resentment in some other countries if we mention where we are going to furnish certain relief and then do not furnish that much. I would like to call the attention of the State Department to the fact that it causes embarrassment and resentment in this country when we are not told what the needs are and where we intend to pour the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that all of us or practically all of us who have carefully perused that secret document think there is not a single statement in there that needs to be kept from the Members of this Congress or the whole of the American people? It is all hush, hush, it is unnecessary, it creates unnecessary suspicion and, naturally, develops opposition rather than support of the program, too.

Mr. VORYS. I can tell you that it is mostly from published figures. It is based on a United Nations report which was made public on January 28, 1947. The only considerations of secrecy are, in my judgment, insulting to the intelligence of the American people and of the Members of this House. I can say without revealing any secrets that the \$350,000,000 figure was picked out of the air. Look at the statement on page 81 of the printed hearings. It is not based on relief needs but on foreign exchange deficits "to prevent economic retrogression," language picked out of the United Nations report.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In furtherance of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has pointed out, and what we have said, it is interesting that some of the top secret material which we of the committee were sworn to withhold from the Members of Congress has subsequently been incorporated in speeches by the Under Secretary of State in Washington and by the Secretary of the State in Moscow, so apparently the only people who are not permitted to reveal the secrets of life to the Members of Congress are the humble servants you have on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has pledged its cooperation to the State Department, and we have preserved inviolate the secret matter here, although we think the secrecy is idiotic. The leaks have come from the State Department; from the Under Secretary and from the Secretary.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. With reference to the gentleman's reference to the amounts having been picked out of the air on page 81, I wish to call attention to a question of mine—

Mr. VORYS. Now, would the gentleman please take his own time to read that? I have so little time.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not blame the gentleman a bit.

Mr. VORYS. I refer all of you Members to the record, page 81 of the hearings, where it will show how this was arrived at. The United Nations report, which is a public document, does not come to \$610,000,000 but comes to \$514,000,000 for the five European nations; recommends nothing to China; is on a basis of 2,300 calories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. I want to point this out that as far as I have been able to determine, this \$350,000,000 was picked out of the air as 57 percent of a figure which was not a United Nations figure but is a secret figure in this book based on a higher calorie content than any European nation, except the neutral nations, is now getting. I think it was planned that this was minimum relief, to carry the whole load if we go it alone, I think it was planned that way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the \$350,000,000 was picked out of the air, will the gentleman tell the House what part of this whole proposition has not been picked out of the air?

Mr. VORYS. Well, if the gentleman will read on page 81, he will find the colloquy which shows how it was picked out of the air, but he will not find out how the rest of the amount was arrived at.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not talking about the amount; I am talking about the whole proposition.

Mr. VORYS. The whole proposition is this, and I am going to answer the gentleman right now. I have criticized as violently and as strongly as I could the way this was presented to us and to the House. We had 12 meetings. There are only hearings of 6 meetings. I think this testimony should have been public and the full information should be public. I have suggestions to make as to administration.

Why should we do this at all? Well, I will tell you why. The people of these countries are hungry, people whose salvation means much to us. They had a pretty tough time of it over there in the war. We are getting along, comparatively, pretty well over here. This bill is an authorization only. The Committee on Appropriations will examine each appropriation under it later. It amounts to a contribution of \$2.50 apiece from the American people to finish up war relief, and we have been told that this will finish up the job of relief to these war-devastated countries—\$2.50 a head over here; one four hundred and ninetieth of our national income. We are told this is temporary. We hope it will be. It goes to our friends. It will help to fight communism. We have control over it, and I hope every one of you will read these sections 3, 4, and 5, which provide that we not only direct and supervise what we distribute, but the distribution of similar goods in that country must be to our satisfaction. If there is a loaf of bread this big, and we furnish one-tenth of the flour in it, we must approve the rationing system for the whole loaf, and it must be distributed without discrimination. We have control over it, and this is a great responsibility, but it assures us that the relief will go where it is intended, and that the people there will know every day through publicity who it is coming from and how it is being administered, and that the Americans are there and helping.

A representative of one of these countries said to me informally, "If you Americans can be over there and supervise it, that is as important as the relief you furnish." I said, "If we furnish supervision, that will cut down the amount of relief." He said, "The assurance that America is interested while we fight this battle against communism, even when Communists are in our country, even when Communist troops are in our country, would help more than just the relief."

So, I say that when we get this bill fixed up we should pass it. It is good power politics; it is a friendly, decent thing to do; and America must not fail.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Is it not true that this will wind up like most of the other programs, that America will have to pay all of the \$610,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000?

Mr. VORYS. No; it is not true. Get this straight. Some misstatements have been made, I am sure by mistake, as to whether 57 percent is an allocation by the United Nations or anybody. The United Nations merely got up a \$514,000,000 suggestion, and they urged that all countries come in and do whatever they could. We are doing that, and we are assured that our country is going to ask and urge other countries to participate. But there are no allocations at all, and they will not need the whole \$610,000,000 to get by.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am interested in the amount and the length of time until this money is spent. Does the gentleman feel that that will eliminate all the hunger and starvation in Europe at that time, that there will be no more hunger, and that our obligation and responsibility will end?

Mr. VORYS. No; it will not. Due to delays caused by Soviet pillage and Soviet obstructionism, and due to delays caused by American maladministration in UNRRA, the whole process has been delayed, but I think another year should see us through.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the statement just made by my good friend from Ohio, who knows I am very fond of him, that mistakes have been made. Certainly I would not even insinuate that any colleague of mine, particularly one of whom I am as fond as I am of him, would intentionally make a mistake that would mislead the House. Yet I realize that, busy as we are, confronted with so many problems both in the House and from our constituents back home, we very frequently do not have time to read a matter through. Consequently I wish to read a paragraph from the same page 81 referred to by my friend a moment ago. In fact, since he declined to yield for that purpose, it will now be necessary for me to read a little more.

On page 81, Colonel Wood, Under Secretary Clayton's deputy, was testifying when I asked him this question relative to the investigation of the need.

I said:

As I recall, Secretary Clayton stated that this study had been in progress 4 months; is that right?

That is, referring to the study of the needs.

Mr. WOOD. Four to six months.

Mr. JARMAN. How many people were engaged in that study?

Mr. WOOD. I would just have to make a guess, but I think at one time or another the people working almost full time on it would perhaps amount to about six.

I would say there were 20 or 30 people involved from time to time just in this country.

Now we have had cables back and forth between all the embassies in these countries and all the agricultural and commercial and financial people in the embassies of these countries have worked from time to time on this. It is almost impossible to give you a categorical answer. It has involved the work of many people spread all over the world.

In addition, of course, we have had the benefit of a great number of surveys. For example, the United Nations sent a subcommittee on devastated areas, on which some of our people were represented, all over these areas. They took about 2 months, I think, for their trip.

It has been an extensive thing. I would say that the people here in Washington who have put all these data together would be six or eight.

Mr. JARMAN. Six or eight in addition to those around the world?

Mr. WOOD. And there have been a lot in the Department of Agriculture. It has not been confined to the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. They were patriotic American citizens who had the interests of this country at heart, were they not?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JARMAN. They were not doing that in the interests of any other country, were they?

Mr. WOOD. I should think not.

Mr. JARMAN. Refresh my memory as to how the 57 percent contribution of ours and the \$350,000,000 were arrived at.

Now I come to the sentence quoted by my good friend a moment ago.

Mr. WOOD. The two, of course, are related. We finally came out with a figure for total relief needs of these countries of \$610,000,000. This figure of \$350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment and in part picked out of the air.

That is the "picked-out-of-the-air" sentence to which my good friend called attention. But let us read on:

We had given 72 percent of the UNRRA funds. We thought it ought to be less because there are many countries, as Mr. Clayton explained, or at least some countries, that have recovered now to the point where they can help on this thing, such as Sweden and Norway. We think we could get more help out of the Argentine, for example.

We thought our proportion ought to be less than 72 percent. We got it down to a figure of 57 percent by considering those various aspects of the situation and applying our judgment to it.

Mr. JARMAN. And the 57 percent makes our \$350,000,000? It is 57 percent of the total?

Mr. WOOD. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. Now while it was taken out of the air, as you say, in a way, it was taken out of the air by competent people after 4 months' study?

Mr. WOOD. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. They did not just grab it out of the air, it was taken out of the air by competent people with the interests of this country at heart after mature study?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the author of the minority report which also includes that quotation and which may have misled my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman speaks of Norway, Sweden, and the Argentine as possible contributors. Is there any evidence in the hearings that any consultations were had with these governments and that there is any probability of their contributing?

Mr. JARMAN. I am not sure as to that. The pressure of business of which I spoke necessitated me missing several hours of the hearings, but I ask the gentleman if he heard the testimony that I just read or if he has read it after the hearing.

Mr. JONKMAN. With reference to the thin air?

Mr. JARMAN. When he prepared the minority report.

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes. It is still grabbed out of thin air. I do not care whether 36 people or 1 person does it.

Mr. JARMAN. You put one part of it in and did not refer to the rest? I do not like to refer to a half truth, but you put part of it in and did not refer to the rest?

Mr. JONKMAN. The fact that 36 people grabbed it out of thin air does not make it any the less so than if one person did.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman, of course, is entitled to his opinion. As I said, I am very fond of all three of the gentlemen who signed that minority report; but I am frank to say that I do not think much of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. In the nature of things, it must be to some extent grabbed out of thin air, because it is based on the future. It is a question of estimate, and every estimate is grabbed, to some extent, out of thin air. When you call it an estimate you dignify it. When you say it is grabbed out of thin air you do not. Of course, this is an estimate. There is no question about that.

Mr. JARMAN. By the very nature of things, but what I resent is the quotation of one sentence and the omission of the preceding and following ones.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman from Alabama that although this is an estimate, it is an advised and studied estimate?

Mr. JARMAN. That is the testimony. Not only is it an advised and studied estimate, but I say to the Members of this House and to the people of this country that should we wait until we are able to know exactly what the relief

needs will be in any country, the unfortunate people of those countries would all be dead and long since buried before we could ever bring a bill to this House.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DORN. On line 22 of this bill it is stated that it will be dispensed regardless of political beliefs. I want to know if it is not possible, then, for some guerrilla outfit in Greece or Austria or anywhere else to obtain our money, in order to overthrow the established and legal government existing in that country?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true, if you have no confidence in those of our people who will be supervising the dispensation of the relief. I do not feel that way myself.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the charming lady, my colleague on the committee.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does not the gentleman think he should point out to the gentleman that no money will be given directly to any nation?

Mr. JARMAN. That is quite true. No money will be given. It is all goods or certificates of credit on banks of the United States, to purchase material.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as has been said, the people of America always have been and ever will be humanitarian people, who not only gladly but eagerly respond to the calls of their fellow men for relief when they are suffering. We have witnessed that in the drives for the Red Cross, the Finnish relief, the Greek relief, and numerous other national and international drives. We have witnessed it back in our little towns when the Community Chest put on a drive for relief of the suffering or when someone in a little town such as I live in went around with a subscription list for a particular family which was in distress. It is that sentiment that will continue, I believe, as long as this is a nation, regardless of whether there is adequate investigation or not, which caused our country to take the lead in sponsoring UNRRA. Foreseeing the suffering that would exist in the liberated countries, our country called a conference at Atlantic City, and UNRRA was born.

Now, the fact has been referred to that UNRRA made mistakes. Yes, UNRRA made mistakes, just as any huge, cumbersome international organization, which had to secure its personnel at a time when it was necessary to literally scrape the bottom in order to get personnel, will make mistakes; just as any of us will make mistakes; just as I have pointed out, not many moments ago, that some of our colleagues sometimes make mistakes, and just as they doubtless think I make mistakes. But, on the whole, the part we played in the organization and functioning of UNRRA is something on which this country can, by and large, reflect with pleasurable pride. There is nothing in the large picture to be ashamed of regardless of these mistakes and errors which naturally crept in. UNRRA was not intended to be a permanent organization and it was fully realized that when it concluded there would remain necessity for

residual relief; consequently, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization last December took under advisement the matter of furnishing this necessary residual relief—after UNRRA ceased to function. It was decided, as has been said, that this be done on a direct basis, unilaterally in a way, that each country would provide its own relief to the country which it wished to relieve under the supervision of the nationals of that country and with the authority it would possess under those circumstances to throw restrictions around the distribution of this relief which we hope and believe will prevent the mistakes that we learned were made by UNRRA. These restrictions are spelled out in the bill and are such that it is entirely possible that one of the countries which the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi are particularly interested in excluding will not be able to meet these requirements and will not enjoy any of this relief. But we feel that while UNRRA was an international proposition in which we could not unilaterally change the rules of the game here on the floor of the House as was attempted, that now when it is our organization and our money entirely, our relief, that as to our part of it we have the right to make the rules and that if the governments of the countries receiving the relief are unwilling to meet the requirements we stipulate in advance that is all we can do and that if any of their nationals starve or suffer because of their unwillingness to meet those requirements, having done our best, we can only be sorry and relief will not be continued, as has been stated so well by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, in countries which refrain from doing so.

What will be the result in many areas if additional relief is not furnished? Food stores will be completely exhausted very soon and inroads will soon occur on seed stocks, seriously threatening future harvests and producing chaos and general conditions quite unpleasant to contemplate. Certainly, it would not be to our advantage to take action which would require starving people to eat the seed which by being planted, can place them on their feet and cause relief to be unnecessary in the future. Even delay will greatly undermine the humanitarian work already done.

Do not overlook the fact that it is contemplated to furnish only the basic essentials of life primarily food, medicine, seed and fertilizers. No reconstruction or rehabilitation whatever is intended. It is hoped that after this program all countries, for the relief of which it is being sponsored, will be self-sustaining with the possible exception of Austria.

I wish to emphasize the fact that specific amounts for the various countries are deliberately not stated or determined. One of the lessons of UNRRA was that when even a tentative allocation to a certain country occurred, that country expected to receive the full amount and felt that it was being mistreated if such did not occur. This was true despite such excellent reasons for a reduction as better crops in the country, lack of supplies or inadequate transportation. It is but natural for hungry people, and particu-

larly starving people, to look rather graspingly on food which they believe has been promised them. As I say, restrictions have been thrown about this relief. If they are not complied with, the President or the Congress can discontinue it to a given country at any time. It is undoubtedly much preferable not to stipulate definite amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, while it is of course the right of any Member of this body to introduce an amendment at any time he wishes, I desire to emphasize and thoroughly agree with the statement made by our great chairman in reference to the deliberations and hearings on this bill. I have read the amendments which will be proposed. I say to you advisedly and after mature consideration that every single one of them was considered by the committee and every single one, at least a majority of them, which came to a vote in the committee was rejected, generally by a rather large vote and not by a partisan vote, for there were Democrats and Republicans voting against each amendment. I agree particularly with the reference by our great chairman, that lovable and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, to what I believe he said was the tortuousness of these hearings, because we went into exhaustive testimony on all these matters much of which was frankly repetitious. Under those circumstances, my friends, while any Member has the right to advance amendments, it seems to me it is not only the right of his colleagues in the House but I think they also have some kind of duty to vote those amendments down about as rapidly as they are brought up; and I believe I can speak for the Democratic side in indulging the hope that such will occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am against House Joint Resolution 153 in its present form and I felt constrained to join in supplemental views on this measure.

The heart of America has always responded to distressed humanity wherever found but it seems to me the time has come when we must blend humanity with common sense. It is not as though the people of our country have not gladly given more than their share to help a distraught world, but the time is fast approaching when the best way we can aid the world is to prove to everyone concerned that democracy will work here at home by keeping this country strong and economically sound.

Let us examine the record. Because of the war it was necessary for us to make vast expenditures until our national debt reached the astronomical figures of \$279,000,000,000. We furnished to our allies during the war over \$35,000,000,000 under lend-lease. According to the Spe-

cial Committee of the House on Postwar Economy and Planning, since the war, we have made loans and credits available to foreign countries amounting to over \$17,000,000,000. In addition we have furnished through UNRRA almost \$3,000,000,000 for relief. This does not take into account the hundreds of millions we have spent for the same purpose through the military in occupied territories not only during but since the war.

In view of these facts it might be well to pause and examine what is proposed to be done under this bill.

A BLANK CHECK

This bill would authorize an expenditure of \$350,000,000 anywhere in the world and without a break-down as to the specific amount for any particular country. So far as the House is concerned, outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Members must rely on the mere statement of the State Department that they would use this authorization in countries where they deem it desirable and in the amounts they consider advisable.

This is blank-check legislation and cannot be justified. There should be named in the bill the countries as well as the amount of assistance each is to receive. It is argued that by so doing you would lead those countries to believe we have made definite commitments to provide the full amount under any and all circumstances. However, it is to be noted the bill provides that relief may be stopped instantly if certain conditions are not complied with by the recipient countries; and it is also within the power of the President to determine the actual needs of a country from time to time. So I do not believe such an argument is valid. But by placing such designations and limitations in the bill it would give the necessary assurance to Congress that relief is only going to be given to those countries that have justified the need, and not in excess of the amount stated in the bill for a particular country.

SECRECY

Most of the important testimony on this bill was given to our committee in executive or secret session. There was furnished us a secret document in which the foreign relief needs for 1947 were estimated for specific countries and the justification for such a program. This secret document is not to be confused with another secret document furnished the committee in justification of the Turkish-Greek program.

I believe my colleagues in the House, outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, should have access to the facts disclosed in this secret document and secret evidence so that they can base their decision on the same evidence that was presented to our committee. The public is entitled to the facts. If this program will not stand upon its own merits in the light of day, and cannot be justified by public testimony disclosing just what is to be done, I do not believe such a program is deserving of our support.

THE BILL FURNISHES MORE THAN FOOD

This bill asks us to authorize \$350,000,000 for relief purposes. An estimate was made for relief requirements for

1947 in certain countries which amounted to about \$610,000,000. Out of this the State Department determined the United States should furnish 57 percent of this amount or approximately \$350,000,000, and other countries should furnish the remainder.

May I say at this point there is no evidence that other countries will furnish the remaining 43 percent of the relief necessary, but on the contrary there is reason to believe this amount will not be forthcoming.

The American people have been led to believe this program is purely a food program to relieve the starving people of Europe. A cursory examination of the bill will disclose that besides food there is to be furnished coal, textiles, and other products for agricultural rehabilitation. I have no quarrel with these objectives. I merely desire to call attention to the fact the relief to be furnished by this bill goes farther than just food.

On what basis were the relief needs fixed at \$610,000,000? According to Under Secretary Clayton's testimony, estimates were based on "imports required to provide the basic essentials of life and to prevent economic retrogression which threatens the supply of these basic essentials." The \$610,000,000 therefore represents, in the countries under consideration, the deficits or the difference between the costs of necessary imports for all purposes and the value of their exports and other available assets for the current year 1947.

For example in order to prevent Italy from "retrogressing" it is not only necessary to import food but also such items as oil, seed, cotton, wool, cellulose, jute, rags, hides, lumber, pig iron, scrap iron, steel, copper, nickel, industrial chemicals, rubber, machinery, etc. So while we are in fact furnishing food to Italy for relief purposes under this bill, by doing so we release sufficient of her foreign exchange to permit her to purchase essential consumer goods, raw materials and other equipment to help rehabilitate herself. If for example Italy's necessary imports for all purposes for 1947 were \$950,000,000 and her exports were \$300,000,000 then she would have a deficit of \$150,000,000 of which we would furnish 57 percent. Again, I have no quarrel with this objective if we understand what we are doing in this bill, but it would be just as logical to say we are going to furnish Italy these other items that are essential, exclusive of food, so that Italy would therefore have sufficient exchange to purchase her own food. It is a case of six of one and a half a dozen of the other.

THE AMOUNT IS EXCESSIVE

According to Mr. Hoover's testimony there is available in the United States out of the present crop year only \$125,000,000 worth of agricultural products which can be used for the purpose of relief. There was some dispute as to this amount. There was other testimony that estimated the supplies available for this year as \$296,000,000—including the new crop—but in no case did the estimate disclose \$350,000,000 worth of food would be available for this purpose.

The State Department apparently contemplates the \$350,000,000 to be used through the first half of 1948—the termination date of this bill. President Truman, however, in his message to the Congress recommending this appropriation, stated:

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

He also recognized there would not be an immediate need for \$350,000,000 because he placed in his 1947 budget only \$100,000,000 for this purpose, and placed the other \$250,000,000 in the 1948 budget.

No human being is in a position to know at this time what supplies will be available after the next crop year. This depends on conditions beyond human control. Because of the fact there is not \$350,000,000 of supplies available this year, and this amount is not needed for relief this year, it might be well that we cut down the authorization at this time to an amount more commensurate with the initial need. Then after a spot check as to this year's crop and after the needs are determined for next year, the Congress could authorize additional appropriations early in 1948, if at that time it is justified by the evidence.

Another plan has been suggested that we authorize the full amount at this time but make immediately available only the amount that would be necessary for the relief load this year. The remainder of the authorization would be available only after the approval of a joint committee of this Congress appointed by the Speaker and the President of the Senate. At least these two alternatives are worthy of serious consideration by the House because it is very easy to allow our humanitarian instincts to be prodigal with the taxpayers' money.

SHOULD THIS ASSISTANCE BE REPAYED

Mr. Hoover, probably the world's greatest authority on relief assistance, believes the program we are undertaking should be repaid. He suggested a practical method how this could be done without in any way crippling the recovery of the recipient countries. His suggestion was that they agree to pay for this aid by placing a tax of 5 or 10 percent on all exports from the debtor country to be paid for in the currency of the countries which receive such exports, and these payments should not begin for 2 or 3 years hence. In addition Mr. Hoover felt that these payments should be made before reparations were paid by any of the recipient countries.

I offered an amendment in committee which in substance provided for such an export tax but received very little support. It is apparent it is the determination of a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee that we continue to give relief all over the world at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

SHOULD WE GIVE FOOD RELIEF TO COUNTRIES DOMINATED BY THE SOVIET?

We are told it is our obligation to furnish food and relief to countries which we occupy. That is the reason we must assume this obligation in Austria and Germany. On the other hand, our ally, Russia, apparently is not asked to fulfill

a similar obligation in countries she occupies or completely dominates. This in spite of the fact Russia is spending huge amounts for armament, occupies the regions which are the bread basket of Europe, and has stripped those areas of the means to provide for themselves. Why should we furnish food to countries where the Soviet have forced the peasants to deliver to them grain under the worst imaginable conditions. Because of our humane instincts we are expected to relieve famine which is, to a considerable extent, the consequence of the coerced economy imposed on the helpless people of eastern Europe by Russia.

While it is very "hush-hush" that the purpose of this bill is not entirely altruistic and is not confined to feeding starving men, women, and children in devastated countries, it is obvious that one of the primary purposes for doing so is to try to win these people away from Soviet domination and to assist those who honestly believe in the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations. I not only think we should recognize this fact but should support it openly.

I, however, see little hope of accomplishing anything in this regard with our relief program in Poland under its present puppet government, dominated and controlled by Russia. In making this statement I am fully aware of the millions of loyal, patriotic Poles who will fight to the death if given the opportunity to remove the yoke of tyranny that Russia has now imposed upon them, but to give aid under existing circumstances would simply shift the burden of relief from the shoulders of Russia to our own, and, I am afraid, would foster Sovietization, as has so often been done in the past, under UNRRA, by liquidating the very ones we desire to help.

The situation is somewhat more hopeful for helping the cause of freedom in Hungary if we should give her assistance, but you cannot blink away the fact the only reason relief is needed today in Hungary is because Russia is currently demanding \$23,000,000 a year reparations from that country including huge quantities of food. Are we at taxpayers' expense expected to supply relief needs to Hungary so that she will be able to pay reparations to our ally Russia?

NOT SUFFICIENT RESTRICTIONS IN THE BILL

Mr. Hoover, after careful consideration, suggested eight or nine restrictions to be put into this bill for the protection of this country, including the appointment of a relief administrator under the President. Amendment after amendment was offered in committee carrying out these and other suggestions but most all of them were opposed by the State Department. According to their viewpoint we are expected to have faith they will do an efficient job as they do not wish to be bound even by reasonable limitations. From my experience I definitely feel we must spell out in this bill the necessary conditions and limitations which we desire if they are to be carried out.

CONCLUSION

I have repeatedly pointed out that I am in full sympathy with the objective of this bill. No one wants to let people

starve. Everybody wants the United States to do its full share. But I again urge while we have this bill before the House we try to make it a constructive piece of legislation which will accomplish its objective with a minimum disturbance to the financial structure of this country, and with restrictions which will assure its administration along sound and economical lines.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I notice I have carried this blue document up here inadvertently, but I will put it down on this table where I will not look at it, because it contains part of the secret testimony our committee received. We had 12 days of hearings. Six days of the hearings are included in this meticulous blue document which means nobody can read them except members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, nobody can speak about them except the members of the State Department who gave them to us, including State Department press releases from Moscow, from Washington, from New York, from Philadelphia, whenever the spirit moves State Department officials to speak. However, I shall turn this document face down so nobody will be disturbed about what we know in reference to this bill and are unable to reveal to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk now about the legislation before us. I find myself in much the same position as the gentleman from Ohio. I am going to support this legislation. I voted for it in committee. I believe that America should undertake its fair share of the responsibility of feeding a hungry, war-torn, and distressed world. I certainly cannot get myself in that marvelous state of happy complacency, however, of the gentleman from Alabama, who preceded me, when he said, "Do not change it, do not dot an 'i' or cross a 't'; this is the finished product. Rise to your patriotic obligation and turn amendments down as fast they come up."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I am going to indulge in the thought that the gentleman misunderstood me, because I did not mean to infer that any legislation at any time is absolutely perfect. All legislation is the result of compromise. What I did try to infer was that this legislation had very careful consideration and study in committee, that the majority of the committee had brought forth what the majority thought was the best it could produce. Under such circumstances I do not consider this floor the proper place in which to write legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have the statement of his modified position. Probably I did not understand the gentleman and I shall therefore solicit his support for some of my amendments which I think are very necessary if we are going to perfect this bill as much as we should.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. I have a question that is troubling me and I trust the gentleman will discuss it as he goes along in his talk. I have it from sources which I consider unimpeachable that in Greece today the casinos are filled, that they have been redecorated and refurnished, that the people are in them 24 hours a day spending more money than they have spent in years.

Mr. MUNDT. Probably they are well-paid UNRRA employees.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, there are poor people in Greece. There have always been poor people in Greece. I gather from the discussion here this morning that part of this money will go to Greece. I am also informed that in Greece they have a practice that has been in effect over a long period of years that every time there is a change in regime all of the army officers are retired, and they are retired at a certain stipulated pay; also that if any government worker files a statement or an affidavit that he has two more relatives dependent on him he is given an increase.

Mr. MUNDT. May I interject to observe that I wish the gentleman's unimpeachable source had been a little more short-winded because he is going to take a lot of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. They file this statement and they get an addition to their pay. The thing that troubles me is, What are the countries themselves, for instance, Greece, doing to meet the problem which is facing their nation through starvation? Are they doing what they can do? I would like that matter clarified somewhere along in this debate and also as it applies to other nations.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be glad to answer the question insofar as it pertains to Greece and in so far as my knowledge makes it possible to do so. I was a member of the congressional committee which inspected the UNRRA operations in Greece late in 1945, and am happy to report that of the four countries in which we inspected the operations of UNRRA—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Greece—that it was only in Greece that we found UNRRA doing a commendable and respectable job. We found there a very shaky and uncertain Greek Government, but it was cooperating with UNRRA splendidly and it was taking the steps that it had available to feed its own population. I do not doubt a bit but what the casinos are filled with people who want to speculate on the roll of the dice. Probably a great many of those casino attendants are American employees of the UNRRA mission and other people who are abroad with American currency as well as people from foreign countries and some of the wealthy Greeks themselves. I know nothing about whether they change the army officers every time they change kings, but if they do, pretty soon there will be no more taxpayers, no more privates, and everybody will be a retired army officer, because they are changing kings awfully fast in Greece. So, I think eventually the retirement system would defeat itself.

I think your main worry should be directed to the Greco-Turkish aid bill, which deals with the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. This does not pretend to deal with internal affairs except to bar the extension of relief to countries which are trying to play politics with it. We are not undertaking to analyze their tax system or their system of representative government beyond that point in this particular legislation. I think that the Members of the House who we hope are going to support this legislation, and who I hope are going to attend the debate and the amendments under the 5-minute rule, will pay close attention so that they can correct this legislation, because if Congress fails to write its will into this legislation and if Congress fails to assume its responsibility for helping to make it more operative, and if Congress fails to measure up to its responsibility as a coordinate branch of Government to work its will on this law, it will simply be because the Members of Congress have not measured up to their opportunities here. I am convinced that the arguments presented partly by the people who signed the minority report and partly by others are so convincing that you will realize that unless you want to become a blank-check Congressman, there are modifications which must be made in this legislation if it is to be made completely effective.

Let me say, first of all, this is not an UNRRA bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was entirely off base when he talked about this in terms of UNRRA. It is not at all an UNRRA bill. There were three glaring weaknesses in UNRRA which this bill corrects, in addition to the fact, of course, that under UNRRA we found it administered by political hacks who did very little about the human philosophy which UNRRA was intended to cope with. Every time a "lame duck" crossed the State line of New York he got a job or an administrative position with UNRRA, and we got the kind of people you might expect, who were rejected by the electorate of New York State.

I want to say in the first place, then, a unilateral approach has been provided in this bill, and that was not true of UNRRA. I attended in Yugoslavia a business meeting of UNRRA in which they were speaking some 16 different languages, and it took them all morning to get through a motion to adjourn and get it interpreted so that everybody understood what the motion was.

Now that feature has been abandoned. This is an American project, conducted unilaterally. It will work out helpfully or harmfully, depending on the type of its administration and the attention that Congress gives to writing in appropriate safeguards when it comes to the amendments suggested. It is an American effort, and it will enhance our reputation abroad or it will detract from it in conformity with the manner in which this legislation is enacted and administered.

The second step is that the House of Representatives has at different times under UNRRA passed amendments which required free access of reporters, newspaper people, and radio folks to report back the operations of UNRRA. It was

called the free-press amendment, you will recall, offered once, I believe, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and once by an author whose name I cannot recall just at the moment. I do know I was among those vigorously supporting both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. This bill includes the free-press provision. It is one of the provisions of this bill.

The third place where this legislation is an improvement over UNRRA is that UNRRA did not enforce any provisions against using its supplies for political purposes. I have in my office a letter from a lady in Warsaw, for example, complaining that in Poland she and her family could not get any relief supplies because they did not belong to the Communist Party, and under UNRRA relief was being used for political purposes. Wherever the Communists had control of the government they took the UNRRA supplies, which were paid for to the extent of 72 percent by us, and used them to condemn America and to promote communism. We can, if we will, as Members of Congress, write into this bill provisions which will make that impossible. Some weak and fluid language is now included. We can make it emphatic and direct and effective. If we fail to do so, we should not complain of the results.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman, for whom I have the greatest respect, not only because of what he has seen but from his study of these problems, can give us any assurance that this political group of UNRRA, as far as our end is concerned, what we furnish to them from our people, will not be administering most of this program.

Mr. MUNDT. That is something to which I think Congress should devote its attention. Already rumors have reached this committee that some more of these political hacks and lame ducks from New York are to be placed on the administrative staff of this bill. I think Congress should write something into the legislation in the way of the amendments I now propose to discuss which would make that impossible.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As to the information that may come out under the provision in the bill that there shall be a free exchange of information, does the gentleman believe that kind of information can be obtained from the present Polish Government? Is there not still an iron curtain in that country?

Mr. MUNDT. I doubt very much that relief can reach the right people in Poland, but I think if the House will adopt an amendment which I propose to offer we can put in provisions which would make it impossible for this bill to

give relief to Poland unless the Government there meets provisions which would distribute this relief without political prejudice or personal bias.

I want to discuss briefly some more amendments I should like to have this body consider pretty seriously before acting favorably on the legislation. The first is this:

At the present time, if this thing is a failure and a fizzle and a flop, no Member of Congress under the bill the way it is now written will know at whom to point the finger of responsibility. The administration of this is scattered all over the lot. President Truman sent former President Hoover abroad to study the bill and report back to Congress, to advise it. His first recommendation was, if you are going to pass this bill you must have a relief administrator who can be held responsible. An amendment will be offered to follow Mr. Hoover's recommendation on this point. I hope it will be looked upon with favor.

Incidentally the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said Mr. Hoover was sent by President Truman to investigate the situation. He came back and he favored it.

He said, "Oh, he made one or two suggestions."

My friends, if you will look at page 54 of the printed hearings you will see that former President Hoover made nine specific suggestions and what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] was talking about was the fact that the committee seriously considered one or two of them before rejecting all of them. That is what he was referring to. But Mr. Hoover did make nine specific suggestions. I hope this House will treat them more graciously than did our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss the other amendments as they are presented to the House for its consideration.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, why do some countries still need help? Within a few weeks the last shipments of UNRRA supplies will leave our shores for the needy people of Europe. The program of that great agency which did so much to bind up the wounds of Europe after the war will be grinding to a stop. I say of that great agency because it was the first international organization in the United Nations. I say great agency because I think it did a perfectly magnificent piece of work.

I do not say that certain funds were not abused, not only by Russia, as has been mentioned here, but they were abused in Greece also. But we could not expect a program of the enormity of the UNRRA program carried out free from all abuse; just as in our relief programs at home with our own people where we speak one language and where we know one another, there have been certain abuses.

The question is: Did the abuses outweigh the good that was done? I think an objective estimate of the job accomplished by UNRRA adds up to the answer—no. I think an objective estimate adds up to the answer that if we had not

had UNRRA there would be chaos in the world today. Maybe we think we have troubles today, but if we had not gone into the war-devastated countries that were literally in ashes, running with blood where the people were exhausted, and where community services had been completely disrupted and transportation no longer existed, where businesses had been blown apart—if we had not gone in with a program of the scope and vision of the UNRRA program, we would not be at the place where we could even contemplate a going concern in Europe in the immediate future.

At this point I pay my respects to the two heads of the UNRRA undertaking—one, Gov. Herbert Lehman, former governor of New York State for 10 long years, and a distinguished public servant. I wish to pay my respects to Fiorella LaGuardia, mayor of New York City for 12 long years, a distinguished public servant and former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I should be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Reference was made to "lame ducks." Does the gentlewoman recall that Governor Lehman was ever defeated in running for the office of Governor of the State of New York, or for any other office?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentlewoman recall that Mayor LaGuardia was ever defeated in running for mayor of the city of New York?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not. Both of those gentlemen were not only capable of understanding the program which they were charged with heading, but they contributed much to the solid achievement accomplished under UNRRA. UNRRA's resources were not unlimited, even though they were greater than three and one-half billion dollars. This is now known to have been insufficient to meet the total relief needs of a number of liberated countries. The job of relief is not quite finished. When UNRRA was first established, it had to determine which countries seeking relief really needed it. This depended not only upon the need for food or clothing and other relief supplies, but also upon the ability of the country to finance the importation of sufficient supplies to supplement its indigenous resources. Some of the UNRRA receiving countries are back on their feet, but others still do not have the foreign exchange to purchase the imports essential to the well-being of their people. It is entirely a problem of the availability of sufficient foreign exchange to finance the necessary foreign imports. If a country does not have adequate foreign exchange, or if its foreign exchange is barely adequate and will be exhausted by purchasing foods for the minimum needs during the next 6 months, they are considered eligible for relief.

The only method whereby starvation and political and economic chaos can be avoided is for those nations which have the strength to do so to make those supplies available without charge, or, conversely, to make the necessary for-

eign exchange available without reimbursement.

In other words, if a country has very limited foreign exchange, and they have to use all that foreign exchange simply to buy food to keep them from starving, or a little cotton or a little coal, and they are not able to use that money to rebuild their bridges, to rebuild their roads, to rebuild their factories, they never can get back on their feet. Their last resources run out. Finally they are right up against a wall. What we propose to do here is to help those countries which do not have foreign exchange; to give them the necessities of life so that they can get back on their feet; so that there will be an end of this relief program—this direct relief program. There will be other programs under the United Nations, but this direct giving of food, this direct giving of the bare essentials of life, we hope, will be finished.

If the nations which have enough fail to make supplies available without charge, those countries which are still unable to finance their minimum essential imports will face a grave crisis between now and the time when their summer harvests will become available for consumption. The peoples of those countries have been undernourished for so many years, and for the last 18 months have had so little from the bare minimum rations needed for subsistence, that they cannot physically stand 6 months' submarginal feeding. Many will actually starve. Many others will become the prey of disease, and still others will become permanently weakened.

The United States has taken an active lead up to the present time in restoring these people to normal health. We cannot, in good conscience, drop them at this point, when a little further effort on our part over a period of months we hope will complete the job which we have undertaken.

Someone asked a little while ago, Was there a guaranty that the job would be completed in 6 months? Of course there is no absolute guaranty, but estimate at the moment indicate that the need for direct relief will come to an end under this program. I would like to point out that the children's program is still to be presented to Congress.

The best evidence currently available indicates that Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Poland will each, in some measure, need further relief during the calendar year 1947, and particularly before the crops are harvested and become available for immediate consumption. It is anticipated also that China may have emergency needs for food imports, to prevent suffering and starvation in certain areas, and some financial assistance may be required for this purpose.

How was the program that we are asked to vote on arrived at? In this last session of the General Assembly the nations of the world agreed that after the UNRRA pipe lines ran out there would be short-term residual relief needs, of approximately 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The United States took the position in the General Assembly that we did not want to continue UNRRA. The reason we took that position was that Congress had made it pretty clear that they did not want to continue UNRRA. For the same reason the United States took the position that we did not want to continue this residual period of relief under an international organization. The United States and Great Britain in the General Assembly and in committee No. 2 urged that further relief be carried on for the next 6 months on a unilateral basis. Every other nation was against such an approach to relief, but because the United States is the great contributor in the world you can see that that put the other nations in a rather embarrassing position. The reason they were against the unilateral approach was because they feared an organizational departure from the United Nations pattern. They feared this pattern might set a dangerous precedent; but finally the nations voted unanimously to carry on the 6 months' needed relief in the unilateral manner proposed by the United States and Great Britain.

Last December the General Assembly of the United Nations appointed a committee of experts to estimate the relief needs of all the liberated areas. This committee met in January on a number of occasions and finally arrived at the estimate of \$583,000,000 as the minimum all-over relief requirements of the liberated areas of Europe; but our own State Department, after exhaustive studies of the figures, concluded that the total need to meet these requirements would amount to \$610,000,000 from the end of UNRRA shipments until the end of 1947.

They believe that no further assistance will be required in any country except Austria. It is pretty well understood that even after the 6 months' period is over Austria may need some more help.

The needs for each country are arrived at by estimating the minimum import requirements in the light of local supplies available based upon minimum feeding ration for the population and the furnishing of other bare essentials. The foreign-exchange resources in each country are then investigated to determine how much of the essential imports each country can finance without foreign assistance and without depleting its foreign exchange to a point at which it would exhaust itself in caring for its immediate requirements.

As I have said, the conclusion of the State Department, which presented detailed facts and figures on this matter in the Foreign Affairs Committee, is that the total relief needs of the liberated areas which must be financed from foreign sources amount to \$610,000,000.

How did we arrive at our share? The administration has requested Congress to authorize \$350,000,000 as the United

States contribution to the total relief needs. It figures out that the United States contribution is 57 percent. You will remember that we contributed twice in UNRRA and that each time we contributed 1 percent of our national income other members of UNRRA also contributed 1 percent of their national income.

You have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] tell you that the contributions made to UNRRA came to 99 percent of the total obligation. By reason of the fact that the United States was not damaged during the war and was hurt as a result of the war very little by comparison with other nations of the world, by reason of the fact that our wealth is so much vaster than all the other countries put together, our 1 percent to UNRRA constituted 72 percent of the total resources of that organization.

Now, during the year and a half since the end of the war other nations have recovered in considerable degree from the ravages they suffered. It is hoped that not only those countries which contributed to the UNRRA program but perhaps some of those countries which were greatly helped through the UNRRA program may be able to help now in this last 6 months of relief which is needed. We do not know. The reason we do not know and the reason nobody can answer that question on this floor is that having decided in the General Assembly that the unilateral approach to relief was best, the program was deliberately left in a more or less loose state among the nations of the world with each one pledged to contribute what they could.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman four additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, each country was to go home and try to find out what they could contribute. The United States does not have to give a red cent to this program. We have not said definitely that we would give three hundred and fifty million but we have implied that we would make our contribution. It was a gentleman's agreement. We do not know what the other countries will give. It was not as though we sat around a table and agreed that each country would give a certain percentage of its income.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentlewoman was one of our delegates to the United Nations Assembly. The United Nations Technical Committee made this study and gave the figures to the world as to the needs of each of the countries. Can the gentlewoman tell us why the United States cannot make its study of the needs of the countries public to the world, why it must be kept secret even though the United Nations has made a similar study and released it to the entire world?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Yes. I can tell the gentleman what the State Department told us and to me it makes sense. Maybe it does not make sense to the gentleman

from Ohio. There is quite a difference between estimates arrived at by the United Nations experts and the estimates arrived at by one government.

The United Nations experts were picked from different parts of the world to estimate the relief needs of the world. Now it is up to us and others able to do so to meet these relief needs as best we can. We propose to contribute \$350,000,000. We do not propose to say to Poland, "You will have so much," and to Austria, "You will have so much," and to Italy, "You will have so much." That is why we have not broken down the \$350,000,000 figure.

Why? Because a few countries are still in desperate need. When we talk about relief needs for another 6 months we are not talking about getting the people of these countries to a place where they live on caviar and champagne. We are talking about getting them on their feet so they can begin to do a good day's work.

If in Italy, for instance, they have a harvest which would make it look as though Italy would not need as much as we planned to give her and we could give an additional amount to Austria because Austria might then be in greater need than Italy, we should be free to do so. If we had published a definite figure for Italy, the Italians would have counted on that exact amount no matter what the conditions, and there would be tremendous resentment. It is very understandable that this should be so—we are not talking about people who are living on the fat of the land.

If we were to suggest that the Italians are a little better off than the Austrians, and therefore we are going to reduce our aid to Italy, I assure you this decision would not be greeted happily. We are talking about people living at levels that are low, so terribly low that to refuse food for the reason that somebody else is more miserable is not appealing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not think there is any division of opinion as to trying to help those people who are in need, but how about the governments themselves that perhaps will ask for the money and which governments might spend large sums on military establishments within the boundaries of their own country. Should we help them? Is that a condition of the bill?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think that would be a condition embodied in an agreement between ourselves and countries receiving relief; we do not propose giving relief to any country that might be spending money on military establishments or equipment.

THE TYPES OF RELIEF SUPPLIES

The bulk of whatever funds the United States contributes to post-UNRRA relief will, of course, be expended for the purchase of foodstuffs, particularly grains, fats, and meats here. However, there are certain other supplies which are essential even to a bare minimum relief job. These include medical supplies of which all the liberated areas are very

deficient; seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides which are urgently needed for summer and fall planting. It is also necessary that a very small amount of fuel be imported into some of the receiving countries since otherwise they will be unable to make adequate use of their transportation facilities and of farm machinery for producing and moving food supplies. Every failure on the part of one of these countries to utilize fully its available resources in such equipment and machinery will add to the total food imports that will be essential to avoid submarginal feeding and to avoid undue exposure to the weather where clothing is in extremely short supply. For the same reason it is anticipated that either clothing will be required or some cotton should be supplied to the textile mills of some of these countries in order that they may manufacture the clothing which they so badly need.

RELIEF IS BASIC TO INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Regardless of what policy we may now or hereafter decide upon in relation to the various countries of Europe, not only the liberated areas but others as well, if we fail to furnish the basic relief supplies to the liberated areas we shall inevitably find that the resultant unrest and chaos in those countries will nullify our best efforts to implement our foreign policies. We can consider what additional economic and political action we may desire to take, but if the liberated areas which are still in need of relief degenerate into political and economic chaos because the people do not have the bare essentials of life, we will soon find that the disease is contagious and will spread over much of the rest of the world. Such an effect could destroy all our best attempts to restore normal trade and to establish strong democratic governments. The needy countries look to us for assistance knowing as they do that we have more with which to aid them than all the rest of the world combined. If we fail them our influence in those countries will be permanently shattered and we will be looked upon with increasing distrust by other nations. Thus, for our own personal advantage as well as for the noblest humanitarian reasons, we cannot afford to shirk the relief job which faces us today.

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT TO RELIEF

The bill which has been reported out embodies a number of conditions which must be agreed to by any country before it can receive the benefits of the United States contribution. Further conditions will be covered in agreements which the State Department proposes to negotiate with each country before it can receive relief. Each receiving country must promise to distribute supplies obtained from us in an equitable manner and without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief. Each country must provide for effective price control and effective rationing. Local funds received from the sale of relief supplies shall be set aside in a special fund and utilized for such other relief purposes as may be agreed upon between the receiving government and the United States Government. Another requirement is that officials of our Government

and representatives of the press and radio shall have freedom to observe distribution and to report fully concerning it, and that the receiving government shall make available to us upon request full information concerning its indigenous resources and its imports from other sources. It may not export any supplies similar to those which we are sending in. It must give full publicity and credit to the United States for its assistance so that the people will know we have not abandoned them in their hour of need. The United States could, and we are assured by the Under Secretary of State would, stop all shipments immediately if any serious abuses should occur. It is thus apparent that in this bill full recognition is given to the need for assuring the proper utilization of relief supplies.

We cannot fail in this critical hour to pass this bill which is so basic to the creation of the kind of a world in which we want to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, Representatives of agricultural districts all over the country are tremendously interested in the far-reaching effects of the relief bill now pending before the House. A group of California Representatives recently met with representatives of agricultural producers in California and thoroughly discussed this entire subject of food for foreign relief. We believe that particular emphasis should be given to former President Hoover's recommendations that, in addition to simply providing food, the necessity for an adequately balanced diet is also essential. I am sure that the interested Government departments are not overlooking this question but there are a few points that I believe should be brought out at this time.

It is the feeling of California agricultural district Representatives that in the administration of purchasing of foodstuffs for all foreign relief by all agencies, consideration should be given to domestic economic effects. It is recognized that the expenditure of funds made available should be with a view to providing the utmost of nutrition for needy peoples. In modification of this, it is, however, urged that since the wherewithal proceeds from the bounty of this Nation, careful consideration should be given to domestic economic effects.

Insofar as practicable, purchasing agencies should consult—should, in fact, voluntarily and jointly set up a coordinating committee including representation from the Department of Agriculture. Requirements should be carefully studied and valued in terms of domestic economic effects. Whereas purchasing heretofore for relief by UNRRA and under current policy, by the Army and other agencies, has been and is concentrated on certain basic commodities such as wheat and other cereals, lentils, fats and oils, milk products, and meat, con-

tinued observance of this policy may unduly inflate prices and may influence production of other commodities unfortunately. It is suggested that through such coordinating agency as is suggested, consideration should be given to domestic economic effects with a view to avoidance of undue inflation of values of certain basic foodstuffs, and that at the same time consideration be given to certain other commodities in bountiful supply having nutritive value reasonably approaching that of the basic essential heretofore enumerated.

It is suggested that whereas the War Department and the State Department may be authorized and may be very properly concerned for the investment of relief funds in the acquisition of the utmost nutritive value, the Department of Agriculture under current statutes has a certain obligation to the agriculture of the Nation. Certain funds are made available to the Department in support of price levels for certain basic commodities. Certain other more limited funds—section 32—are made available for price support for a wide range of agricultural production.

Insofar as some commodities may become available in such bountiful supply as to unduly depress prices and threaten disaster to producers, and insofar as such supplies may have any fair adaptation to relief uses, and may incidentally have enjoyed export outlets under normal conditions, it is respectfully suggested that purchase for relief may avoid impending undue deflation of values.

Although the caloric value of investment for relief purposes may not in every case be quite comparable to investment in wheat even at current values, the cost to this Government may be much less than the latter cost of making good the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to support prices.

In another sense it is suggested that the vast investment which this country must make in winning the peace and sustaining a sufficient segment of the world under the system of democracy which will permit our continued enjoyment of the institutions we cherish, must be regulated and coordinated in a fashion comparable to that which applied to the recent greater investment in the wasteful purposes of war. These influences threaten the stability of the capitalistic profit-and-loss system on which our type of democracy depends for its existence.

Whereas the productive capacity of this Nation finally won World Wars I and II for this Nation and its allies, the same productive capacity must now be made available and applied to the winning of the peace. Consideration must be given to economic stabilization.

Members from the great agricultural Midwest, from the grazing lands, from industrial areas, in fact, Members of the Congress generally, should have concern for avoidance of economic dislocation. The world program today calls for an extraordinary direct expenditure by our Government and indirectly from funds loaned or otherwise made available by our Government, largely concentrated on foodstuffs. Price of foodstuffs more than anything tends to determine through labor and otherwise the domestic infla-

tionary trend. Certainly our suggestion for avoidance of dislocations through a studied application of this purchasing power should command support from Congress.

We do not recommend a spread of the investment to provide luxuries but as we consider the national program of investment, loans, and beneficence which may amount to billions over the period of a few years, we do suggest the broadest possible application in the re-investment in the products of this Nation.

We do not recommend that our Government take over purchasing for foreign government missions, but that in connection with a coordination of its own procurement program steps should be taken to coordinate the activities of foreign agencies.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes UNRRA residual relief for such countries as the administration may select in the sum of \$350,000,000, to be distributed up to June 1948.

It is an administration bill. It seems to come to the Congress as "must" legislation. In other words, innocuous amendments are permissible. But the sum to be authorized, the term of the duration of the relief, and the countries and peoples to receive relief, as well as the nature and extent of that relief, apparently are matters the Congress must not inquire about and upon which it is not competent to pass judgment. These things the State Department apparently knows best.

I am sure that most of us would like to be able to believe that. The administration has had an intimate experience in and with UNRRA for 2 years since VE-day. It should be able to present facts and figures that would carry conviction with them, and make the needed legislation simple for the Congress. But I am apprehensive that such is not the case.

The original bill in its preamble states that—

Whereas for humanitarian reasons and in order to promote healthy economic conditions abroad which are essential to the security and economic well-being of the United States and of the world, the Government of the United States desires to assist in the furnishing of such relief: Therefore—

And so forth. This could well support the presumption of the administration that for any Member of Congress to oppose this legislation would mean that he was wanting in humanitarian instincts and indifferent to the security and economic well-being of the United States, and that, therefore, there would be no opposition to the administration's promoting healthy economic conditions abroad. They did that through UNRRA—67 cranes at \$20,000 each and 5 or 6 bulldozers at \$10,000 each, most of which were never used, and so forth. That is the way UNRRA gave relief to starving people.

However, the problem is not so simple as that.

The American people have a deep sympathy for the seriously undernourished men, women, and especially chil-

dren in other lands. The American people have always been generous and liberal in helping the unfortunate. And they still are, and wish to help feed them, where help is needed. But they want to really help, and in accordance with their means. Members of Congress have the same feelings and objectives. But as representatives of the people, they are also bound by the time-honored maxim that "they must be just before they are generous with the taxpayers' money."

Before considering foreign grants by our Government for the relief of any and all nations of the world who may be in destitute circumstances, we should consider—

First. What resources and substance have we at our disposal?

Second. What do we need to maintain and support our own way of life?

Third. What is sought of us abroad, and how long will the need continue?

Fourth. What good purpose will be served by any program we may initiate?

We have to consider our national debt of two hundred and sixty billion; our over-all National, State, and local tax burden amounting to 35 percent of our national income; whether that national income, at present amounting to one hundred and seventy billion, is temporary or permanent. We have to consider the drain on our production machine—already the State Department admits that we are short two-fifths of the grain cereals in this program and they will have to come from the next fall crop. We must bear in mind that these exports are destroying our economy like a two-edged sword by their cost in taxes on the one hand, and the inflation from the resulting scarcity on the other hand.

In the proposed prodigal program to reach occupied, liberated, and even neutral nations we will be dissipating our strength and service without having reached the children, the men and women who really need help, and whom we could reach by a judicious, well-considered application of the limited means at our disposal. If we are to relieve the peoples of foreign nations, it must be done on the limited scale of seeking to meet only the most urgent and necessary needs, and only in those countries where these needs exist.

If our substance is strewn about with prodigality, waste, and worse, we will soon find that we are unable to help where help is really needed. We do well to bear in mind that there is another four hundred million proposed for Turkey and Greece, four hundred million to reimburse war damages for Filipinos; that we will probably be called upon by the United Nations organization for seventy-five millions for the International Refugee Organization, forty millions for infant feeding; that Korea apparently wants six hundred million, and so on ad infinitum.

It seems that the administration has paid very scant attention to these considerations.

In the first place, we know that this bill grows out of the recommendation of the General Assembly of the United Nations, made last December. However, it made a proposal of residual relief for a term of 6 months following the termi-

nation of UNRRA on March 31. Herbert Hoover also recommends a 6 months' term to end with the fall harvest. The budget contains a provision for \$100,000,000 for 1947 and \$250,000,000 for 1948. In his message to Congress recommending this appropriation, the President stated:

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

The Under Secretary states, on page 3 of the hearings, in accord with the President's message, with Hoover and the United Nations, that the need is "particularly acute during the spring and early summer months," and that "there is every reason for anticipating that these countries will not need further free relief after 1947." And yet, in the bill, the State Department asks for sufficient relief to operate until June 30, 1948. Why should they ask to operate until June 30, 1948, when every recommendation, including their own, rebuts the necessity for such a long term? The only reason I can see is that if they should ask for three hundred and fifty million for 6 months, this would mean at the rate of seven hundred million a year. That is considerably more than half of what we contributed to UNRRA per year, and this would not sound well as residual relief. When the Department finds that our stock of grain cereals is only sufficient for three-fifths of their requirements, they blandly propose that the other two-fifths be supplied from our crops next fall—page 97. How will that help for the spring and early summer months of the present year?

In the second place, the State Department asks for blank checks up to the amount of \$350,000,000 to be used in any country they see fit. It is true, they say, that at the present time they have in mind six countries—Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and possibly China. But that is only their present intention, and they reserve the right to make changes and additions if the relief funds are not used in the above areas or if, in their judgment, they should find that the money should be diverted to other areas.

Not only that, but they wish to keep secret the break-down of this \$350,000,000 and the figures they have used as the needs of each country. In other words, they are asking the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to stultify themselves and come to Congress and the people, advocating the grant of \$350,000,000 without giving the basis of their calculations. This ostensibly is none of the business of the Congress or the people.

It is true, they use as an excuse the pretext that once the allocation for each country is given, that country will consider that allocation as our debt to them, and a cut would cause dissension. We are not impressed by this argument for keeping Congress and the people in the dark. How can the State Department assure enforcement of the stern conditions precedent proposed in the bill for the giving and continuation of relief when they show the aforesaid weakness? How do they expect to enforce nondiscrimination, freedom of the press, full

publicity, and supervision if they dare not discontinue relief when it is not needed?

The State Department proposes to lay down such conditions for the distribution of this relief without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; they tell us that where such assurances are not given, they positively will not go in and give relief; that in such cases the allocated amount will be used in other countries.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBSION. It is said that it shall be distributed without regard to creed or politics? That would include Communists and other subversive groups, would it not?

Mr. JONKMAN. It certainly would.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The purpose will be, however, to prevent discrimination in favor of Communists. That is the purpose of that restriction, is it not?

Mr. JONKMAN. Certainly. I am not satisfied that such conditions will be accepted, for instance, in Poland or Hungary, which are absolutely dominated by the Communists; and in such event I do not approve of spending it in other countries with prodigality. But even if such conditions were accepted in those countries, does anyone believe relief would go to deserving Polish patriots as freely as to the adherents of the Communist Party line? Past experiences all show the contrary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that the reason that the amendment which the gentleman just spoke about was put in the bill, to make sure that it is not prejudicial either for or against Communists?

Mr. JONKMAN. It ostensibly was put in so that if a country is Communist-dominated relief will not be given there if discrimination in distribution favors Communists.

I am just as desirous of aiding those really in need in these countries as any other person; but if those people cannot be reached, is it wise to give such supplies to the governments of such countries where they will be used to bolster up the Communist movement?

There are other considerations which fall almost within the same category. For instance, on page 75 of the hearings it is admitted by the State Department that by this relief to Hungary we will be paying Hungary's reparations bill of 23 millions a year to Russia; that if Hungary had no reparations to pay, the relief would not be needed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman submit to a question at this point or at least yield for an observation?

The gentleman has in his last statement developed a very important point, which is that if we do not want this money to be used by Russia for the purposes of that country, we ought to adopt the so-called Colmer amendment or a similar amendment that will be offered by the gentleman or some other Member

of the majority providing that no part of this fund shall be expended in any country presently dominated by Russia.

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, that would not go to the people that we want to reach but to those they want to reach.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman is correct in his statement with reference to the admissions made by the Department of State.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then in Greece, of course, there will be duplication in that another economic mission will be set up there under the so-called bill for \$400,000,000 relief to Turkey and Greece. Paul Porter has already admitted that the undertaking to Greece provided for in this bill should be merged with that in the four hundred million to be authorized by the Greece-Turkey bill.

It is even questionable what provision this bill makes for feeding undernourished children in the countries designated. Certainly they should be our first care and consideration. A reading of page 41 of the hearings speaks of a future contribution for that purpose. Certainly, such supplementals as cod-liver oil and milk for children are in as much immediate need as anything for anybody.

While the Greece and Turkey aid bill is primarily concerned with reconstruction and military aid, the bill presently under consideration also transcends the bounds of strict relief and goes into rehabilitation and reconstruction, as indicated on page 4 of the hearings and in the bill itself, reciting processed and unprocessed materials for clothing and fuel, while the so-called secret documents seem to go even further than that.

In the third place, the State Department, while assuming that other nations will contribute as in UNRRA, has no assurance that they will join us in this undertaking.

The over-all cost of this relief undertaking has been set at \$610,000,000, of which the State Department proposes that we pay 57 percent, or \$350,000,000 with the other 43 percent, or \$260,000,000 to be borne by other countries. However, this seems to have had only scant consideration. On page 81 of the hearings, the State Department says:

This figure of \$350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment and in part picked out of the air.

With reference to the willingness of other nations to contribute, according to the hearings on page 10, the only definite assurance they had was with reference to Great Britain's contribution in Austria, which they claimed had already received \$40,000,000 from Britain. They emphasize this time and again—pages 3, 10, 11, 88, and 90—although on page 88 it is clear they are pessimistic about further aid from Britain. As this seemed rather anomalous that Britain would be pulling out of Greece and yet be distributing relief in Austria, inquiry at the proper source elicited the information that this \$40,000,000 was a straight sterling loan to Austria and not a grant. The State Department later qualified its statement and admitted that it was partly a grant and partly a loan, and there the matter stands with reference to Britain.

The only other nation consulted, as far as the record shows, was Canada. After several discussions, they got no further than that the Canadian Government was sympathetic and thinking about it.

Australia last year suffered severely from drought and probably will be unable to assist. Yet if other countries contribute in the same ratio as they did in UNRRA, these three countries, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, will have to contribute two hundred fifteen millions of the two hundred sixty millions expected from the other nations of the world under this program.

Under UNRRA the United States contributed annually \$1,350,000,000 to the operational fund against a total of four hundred ninety-nine million by all the other nations combined. Of this amount the United Kingdom subscribed three hundred twelve millions, or about 62 percent, Canada sixty-nine millions or about 14 percent, and Australia thirty-eight millions or about 8 percent. At the same ratio the United Kingdom would have to contribute under this program one hundred sixty millions, Canada thirty-five millions and Australia twenty millions.

In other words, the \$260,000,000 to be contributed by other countries has by no means been assured to the State Department; or do they seem to have considered whether, if any countries should contribute, these would have to set up their own relief agencies or whether the United States in this venture would become a fiscal agent of foreign countries.

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity. Its analysis of needs might be very misleading. To arrive at a country's needs it strikes a balance of the excess of estimated imports over exports and assumes that the resulting shortage is the exchange needed to buy necessities of life and to prevent economic retrogression. In other words, if, as was reported from Greece on March 29, she squandered her foreign exchange by "importing 19 tons of colored combs of all sizes, huge quantities of toy balloons, nylon, and lipsticks of all shades, and other fantastic types of commodities," this would raise her imports that much in excess of exports; and according to State Department diagnosis, she would need that much more exchange to purchase the necessities of life.

In short, there may be no relation of this unfavorable trade balance to the food supply. It is similar to a squandering family which may produce or earn—export in goods or services—\$100 a week and spend—import—\$125. It is certainly running into trouble and will need credits or loans, but that does not necessarily mean that the children are not being fed, although, of course, such may be the case.

Or, if you want to absolutely clinch this fallacy, just consider what the administration includes under import needs. The American people are led to think import needs means food, seeds, medicines, and so forth. But to arrive

at the needs of, that is, one country for the authorization in this bill—in other words to feed starving people—the import needs for 1947 include industrial oilseeds, cotton, wool, cellulose for rayon, raw jute, wool rags, cattle hides, calf hides, cellulose for paper, lumber, pig iron, steel products, iron scrap, copper, tin, nickel, rubber, totaling \$250,000,000. Of course, a part of this can be paid for with exchange received from exports, but the bulk we are furnishing under the name of direct relief. This probably explains why, as I said at the outset, the preamble speaks not of direct relief, but of promoting healthy economic conditions abroad.

The same uncertainty lies in their proposed machinery for the distribution of relief. The relief goods will be turned over to the controlling governments for distribution. This is the same hurdle that caused such a miserable flop in UNRRA. But the State Department says, on page 33 of the hearings "if you did it effectively—direct distribution with American personnel—it would take all this money to pay for the personnel to look after it."

The question may well be asked: How much of the money will it take to make an effective check on ruling governments' distribution? And if we do not make this supervision effective, how do we know our aid goes to the right people?

I propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization in this bill to \$200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947. Then if there is urgent need at the approach of spring and early summer of 1948, Congress will be in session and can make further authorization at that time. We will also have a better view of the over-all picture at that time.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, including the time yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, has 1 hour remaining; the gentleman from New Jersey, 55 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter into this discussion or to analyze the provisions of the bill until I heard about the so-called Colmer amendment which, along with other countries, would exclude the people of Poland.

What I wish to say to the Committee—and I would that this might enter the hearts of the membership of the entire House—is this one warning: Do not let your hatred of communism blind you to the extent that it will strengthen communism itself and drive into the arms of the communistic ogre the millions of anti-Communist Poles in that unfortunate country. Remember, there are

fewer than 600,000 Communist Poles out of something like 24,000,000 people, and do not forget that they are only nominal Communists. I have talked to some of them. I would hate to mention their names here or state who they were, or what their standing in the affairs of Poland because of the results which might follow such disclosure.

The people of Poland, nearly all of them are waiting, they are biding their time; at present they are helpless and to a great extent it is our fault that they are helpless today. We have put them in a position where they could not properly take care of themselves, could not defend their ideals. That was a long time ago.

If you want to encourage the democratic elements in Poland and the other countries—and do not let anybody tell you that they do not know their friends, for they do—give them assistance. Suppose you do give assistance to some of these nominal Communists in Poland. It will be on the basis of less than one 1 to 24. Twenty-four will be anti-Communist Poles. Remember that. Do you want to nourish, strengthen that element? Do you want to stop communism dead in its tracks? Then give some encouragement to this desperately driven element in this country which finds itself in that unfortunate condition due to a certain extent to the lack of foresight on the part of ourselves.

Our people had too much of the wrong kind of advice at Tehran and at Yalta, and I am not so sure whether that kind of advice was not still present at Potsdam. It is not the fault of the people of Poland that communism is on the loose in that country.

The time to make some amends, the time to strengthen the anticommunistic element in Poland, and in the other countries similarly situated, is now. In every instance the relief that you give to these people will go, nineteen-twentieths of it, to the people who despise and hate communism just as much as you and I.

Let me say by way of presenting my credentials, to the Members of this House, particularly with regard to some of the younger Members, that long before this war I consigned to the nether regions, to just plain hell, Stalin and Hitler. I said the same thing about the other criminal or second team of Molotov and Ribbentrop. Two of these have already gotten their just reward—Hitler and Ribbentrop. The others, Stalin and Molotov, I hope, will join that bestial quartet soon. However, my hatred of communism does not blind me to the fact that we have a job to do, that there are desperately needy people in Poland. Yes, take Yugoslavia, which is not included here. Do you know that there are millions of Serbians and Croats and others who are fighting communism today as much as ever? Do you know, and doubtless you must because it is something that is of current knowledge to everybody, that in the hills of Yugoslavia there is a radio voice which blares out to the world, particularly to communism, its defiance of communism and all it stands for. Those people need our assistance. They are looking to avowed

anti-Communists, their friends here in America and elsewhere, for whatever encouragement we can give them. What they need mostly right now is sustenance, food, machinery, things to help them get on their feet. You strengthen Poland sufficiently and you will have the strongest anti-Communist force in Europe. She always has been anti-Communist. In 1939 there were less Communists in Poland per capita than there were in this country or in any other place in the world. Do you know why? Because they told me that all they had to do was turn to the East and sniff, and they got the stench of communism in their nostrils. They know communism better than we do and they abhor it. The hate of communism in the heart of every liberty-loving Pole is so strong that he will bide his time and suffer anything, but in due time he will turn on the vile Communist and drive him back to where he came from. The Poles will forever remember the treacherous stab in the back Russia gave them in fulfillment of her agreement with Hitler.

If you want to aid this genuinely democratic element, now is the time to do so. I did not have the opportunity to listen to all that went on in the hearings, but I did read certain excerpts from the testimony of Will Clayton with reference to agreements to be made with recipient countries. I am confident from what I know of Will Clayton and as to his ability, as to his character, as to the warmth of his patriotism, when the time comes and the appropriation is made and the agreements are made, I am confident, I say, that men of the type of Will Clayton will see to it that the right parties will in all probability disseminate the goods that are provided under the terms of this bill. This is not an appropriation; it is merely an authorization.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman can assure us that there has been such a change in the personnel of the State Department that we are going to get any better advice now than we got before at Tehran and Potsdam?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I could not say. I could not speak for anyone else. I think that the State Department on the whole has always been trustworthy and guided by very able men; by such able men as the illustrious Cordell Hull, a former Member of this House, and one of the outstanding citizens of his time. I felt pretty much the same way about the sincerity and ability of Mr. Stettinius, and I have the highest possible regard and affection for the great Secretary of State, George C. Marshall. I am confident that he and his advisers will not only do everything they can to help the people of Poland, but that whatever action they take will be for the purpose of establishing freedom, independence, and all the things that we believe in.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that the State Department could enter into a valid, enforceable agreement with the present Government of Poland so that we could be assured that this relief will get to the people?

Mr. DINGELL. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I certainly do believe that we could enter into such an agreement with that government. My knowledge of the personnel of that government—and I do not know them individually, but there are some, I dare say, who despise and hate the very thought of communism, the same as the gentleman who raised the question, and that they, too, are waiting their time when the situation will change and Poland once again will be free.

Might I say now, too, that so far as the personnel of this great committee is concerned, I believe that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the distinguished chairman of this committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EARN], whom I have known so long and so favorably for all these years, are not being fooled about the possible effect of the fulfillment of this bill. I do not think they would have cooperated and reported it favorably if there was any doubt that a valid and enforceable agreement could be entered into with the present Government of Poland. We hold the whip hand and the control and can revoke any agreement that has been violated.

Let me just say this: We have distributed much of the worldly goods in Poland, not only through UNRRA, but through private sources and through the Roman Catholic Church, and I have assurance from at least the source that had to do with the distribution of food through the Roman Catholic hierarchy that the food did go to all the needy people in Poland, and if it did—and some of them might have been nominal Communists—the distribution by the law of averages went more than 24 to 1 in favor of the anti-Communists.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to subscribe to the argument the gentleman has presented so forcibly that the more we are opposed to communism in Poland, the more we must do our best to help those who are fighting it, and who are fighting it on the ground. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not a fact that ordinarily Poland has agricultural surpluses?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; ordinarily that is true.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not more likely to be true this year than before because of the fact that she has taken over some of the richest agricultural areas of Germany?

Mr. DINGELL. I should not agree to that for just this year. I think it is possible for the future, but from my understanding of it that is not so and it is not

contemplated that there will be any surplus this year. But should it be so, the agreement is not irrevocable.

Mr. JUDD. That is the point I want to bring out. Does the gentleman have any information as to the prospects for crops this year in Poland?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not.

Mr. JUDD. We could not get information on that in the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. From what little I know of that phase, some crops have been hard hit in Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JUDD. What is the big reason for the failure when they normally have surpluses, internal confusion?

Mr. DINGELL. They have had one of the most severe winters in the history of Poland, which has decimated the wheat crop, and the rye upon which the Poles depend so strongly is also in short supply.

Mr. JUDD. Have the work animals been taken away?

Mr. DINGELL. The work animals have been taken away, and of course that is a basic thing that has to be corrected. You remember that the Germans took every horse and milk cow in the nation, all the livestock and fowl, down to the last goose; they took every piece of industrial and farming machinery that was in Poland, it all went into the maw of the steel mills in Germany. Remember that in Poland they had far more mechanized farming than they did in Germany. I remember seeing it there in 1939. I saw American tractors, I saw American threshing outfits, I saw men and women working with American farm machinery, then I saw women using hand sickles just across the border in Germany. But that is all changed. Their farm implements and animals sequestered by the German invaders are only now being replaced by UNRRA and other relief supplies.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think that if we get Poland through this particular hard year she ought to be on a self-sustaining basis?

Mr. DINGELL. That is my hope and my prayer, and I think it will materialize.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I just want to call attention to the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. EATON], and the distinguished gentleman from New York, were fooled when they supported and pushed through the UNRRA program.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman may have his opinion about being fooled about UNRRA, but the fact of the matter is that UNRRA on the whole did a splendid job in spite of the fact that it had its human defects. It nevertheless did a splendid humanitarian job.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will yield, I cannot agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] with reference

to UNRRA. I think UNRRA did a very good job under the circumstances.

Mr. DINGELL. I said that.

Mr. BLOOM. If it were not for the job that UNRRA did at the time, I hate to think of the condition the world would be in today.

Mr. DINGELL. And how many additional corpses there would have been in Poland and in all the other needy countries.

Mr. BLOOM. We would not have enough money in this country today to do the job we are trying to do now with \$350,000,000. We ought to be thankful for the job UNRRA did so, notwithstanding the fact that it made a lot of mistakes.

Mr. DINGELL. May I say in conclusion that if it had not been for UNRRA not only in Poland but in the other unfortunate and in large part subjugated countries there would have been millions of additional persons who would have died of hunger, cold and disease. Remember it is said that as a result of the war most of the children in Poland up to 18 years of age are tubercular, and various other diseases are rampant throughout that unfortunate country. What would have happened if it had not been for UNRRA? You may find fault with UNRRA, and it was humanly defective, no question about it, but it did an emergency job and it did a splendid job in spite of the fact that we were not fully satisfied.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak at all today, as I have had the unfortunate mishap of losing most of my voice. But there have been things said during this debate which impel me to make an attempt to speak briefly.

May I say just one word about UNRRA because I was among those who fought very hard to have that bill contain some protection against the political use of food. Unhappily, we were unable to get any such restrictions or limitations into that particular legislation. Though I am quite in agreement with the statements that have been made about UNRRA doing a great deal of good, I have been forced to realize that, in addition, UNRRA did a good deal of harm—political harm.

But to get on to my subject. Your Committee on Foreign Affairs began its study of this bill a good many weeks ago. Since that time certain changes have taken place in the general situation. But there is no less desire on the part of the people of this country to do whatever we can to feed the hungry and to give medical aid. Naturally, we had to take cognizance of some of the things which have been brought to our attention in the meanwhile. One of those is that the demands upon us are going to be so great that we should know rather more definitely than we do what our own possibilities are. We are not going to be able to do the job which lies before us to do—to be the hope of the world—unless we have a certain strength here

at home. That strength is of many different varieties. I am not going to enlarge upon that.

It would seem that we do need in this legislation a definite control of the money and we need a very real plan. It has been noted to you that Mr. Porter suggested that this relief, or part of it, be added to the bill which will be coming to us in the not too distant future with reference to a different kind of assistance to Greece and Turkey. I think it is very important that this bill be not mixed up with that bill and that we stop thinking of it as an extension of UNRRA because it is not an extension of UNRRA.

The reason for House Joint Resolution 153 is not to stop totalitarian expansion. We get the opportunity to have something to say about that in another bill. It is really to feed the hungry; and if we are going to feed the hungry we better do it before they starve to death. We cannot wait indefinitely before helping them. Of course, indirectly, if we feed the hungry, and they know it comes from a capitalistic country, and if it is done well and it reaches those who really need the help, we will do something to stop some of that expansion because we would then be demonstrating what we as free men and women can do in the world. We have shown them that nobody fights quite so well as a man who is free and no woman in any part of the world goes to his help and is quite so capable as the woman who is free.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the lady from Ohio five additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. In order to make my own position clear on this legislation, I would like to state reluctantly that I am as impatient at the tactless and rather stupid action of the State Department with the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House as anyone in the House. I regret extremely that they still feel they can bring us with impunity a lot of material all bound up, top secret stuff, when that same material is available to all in other places. It would appear that they feel we are of very little account. I confess I am inclined to serve notice on them that if they are not careful the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, at least the majority side of it, may notify them that we will oppose legislation presented to us in such fashion on the basis that such methods do not give us adequate material with which to present it to you. In the matter of this bill it seems to me that it is so necessary that we provide some method of giving expression to the generous inclination of the American people, recognizing the need to feed adults and children, that I shall vote for this bill.

I have a great deal of confidence in the membership of this House, Mr. Chairman. I trust that what is written in by the membership in the form of amendments will have the proper constructive necessity to make it possible for us to do the job in an efficient American fashion, that will satisfy our people, and that will not make such inroads upon us that we cannot meet the needs of our expanding responsibility. Those needs are going to be very great, Mr. Chairman,

for upon us, without any doubt, will rest the future of our civilization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the lady yield for a question?

Mrs. BOLTON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Under section 4 of this resolution it is provided that when these supplies are transferred or made available, the President shall cause representatives of this country to see that certain things are done to supervise their distribution. I do not seem to find in the next section, in the provisions for cutting off relief, any correlative provision, to say in effect that if the President's representatives are not able to make that report, the relief may be cut off.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman will find the answer on page 4, line 16, under clause (g). They must give assurance, before the relief is given to them, that they will allow representatives of the United States to supervise. Then, under section 5, it says he shall terminate the supervision of relief assistance if he finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not carried out.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. And if the President does not stop it at this point, the Congress has the power to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, covering this legislation.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Is that secret?

Mr. EATON. It is not secret.

The CHAIRMAN. That request would more properly come when we are in the House.

Mr. EATON. Then I wish to read the letter if that be appropriate at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. EATON. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read this letter for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 23, 1947.

The Honorable CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

MY DEAR DR. EATON: In response to your request I am indicating below our answers to certain questions regarding the proposed post-UNRRA relief program.

Question. What will be the agency set up in any Government department or independently for the purpose of administering this relief, and who will be appointed to be the administrator?

Answer. It would be our intention to appoint a relief director in Europe who will supervise the relief program. We believe that the most important and critical function in connection with the proposed program is the supervision of the distribution

of our relief supplies and the enforcement of the undertakings which would be required of the countries receiving relief. This can most effectively be done in Europe rather than from Washington. It is planned to recommend that Mr. Richard F. Allen be appointed to this position. He was in charge of Red Cross relief activities in Europe after the First World War and during the Second World War was vice chairman of the American Red Cross in charge of all its activities in Europe. Mr. Allen would receive his instructions from the Secretary of State. A relief mission consisting of well-qualified American citizens would be established in each country receiving our help. These missions would work closely with our Embassy and would function under the general supervision of the relief director.

In Washington the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Bureau of Supply, and other agencies would perform the procurement, supply, and shipping functions which they are properly equipped to handle. The programing of supplies and the coordination of the activities of these agencies would be done by a staff under the direction of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. William L. Clayton.

Question. What will be our policy regarding relief grants to countries, the governments of which are not in our opinion representative and democratic, or have not been elected in elections held pursuant to applicable international agreements?

Answer. It would be our policy to offer to help in preventing suffering and serious malnutrition in such a country to the extent that our assistance is clearly needed for this purpose. We have subscribed to the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations which states the principle that at no time should relief supplies be used as a political weapon and calls upon all members of the United Nations to assist in the furnishing of relief when needed and where needed. Our help would be made available only on the condition that the government of the country agrees to the stringent but fair conditions specified in the bill and lives up to these conditions faithfully. These are calculated to provide adequate assurance that relief aid would reach the people needing it and would not be used to promote the political aims of the government. Furthermore, the requirements for full publicity in the country would insure that the people would know the American source of the help and would understand its purposes. Our estimates indicate that Poland is the only such country which may need relief from us.

Question. Is it intended that the amounts authorized in the bill will be adequate to take care of the relief need of the countries assisted through to the end of the crop year 1948?

Answer. The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program, some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria, we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur.

Question. What measures will be taken to see that each country receiving relief assistance does everything possible to help itself and reduce its needs for relief as soon as possible through utilization of its own resources and the work of its own population?

Answer. The bill requires that any country receiving relief must exert all possible efforts to speed its own recovery. It further provides that our relief shall be terminated if we are not satisfied that this is being done. We would keep a close check on the activities of the countries in this regard.

Question. What assurances or expectations do we have of assistance to the coun-

tries to be benefited from other countries than our own as contemplated by the program?

Answer. The British have announced a program of \$40,000,000 in aid to Austria. The Norwegian Parliament has voted the equivalent of \$3,000,000. Denmark is making available the equivalent of \$4,000,000. New Zealand has stated its intention to make available some meat and other commodities. On the basis of consultations which have been conducted with other countries, we believe that additional contributions will be forthcoming if favorable action is taken by the United States, since some countries are waiting to see what action we take.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Sadowski].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I must take just a few minutes to express my opposition to the warped thinking behind these so-called Colmer amendments that will be offered later. I cannot understand how anyone can have this bitterness, this hatred, this inhumane feeling toward the Polish people. What have they done to deserve this? What other people have suffered as much as those people have in this war? What other people were greater allies of ours than were the Polish people? Why this attitude toward those people? Was it their fault that they were overrun by the German Army and by the Nazis? They did not wish it, they did not desire it. It happened. Nazism and Nazi ideology was sought to be impressed on those people. Was it their fault that they were overrun by the Russian Army, that the Communists came in? They resented it. They have fought communism and nazism more than any other people in the whole world.

You may say, "I do not like the government in Poland." Well, 95 percent of the people of Poland may not like their government either. Does that mean they must starve to death? Is it of their own choice? Is it of their own choosing? How can anyone take that position now and say, "We are not going to continue to aid these people who have suffered so much because they happen to be bordering along Russia?" Geographically they are in a bad way, it is true, but they cannot help that. Geography made it so.

Let us help those people. Everyone who has come back from Poland, including Bishop Woznicki, of Detroit, as well as the people who have gone down there with Catholic relief organizations and with the UNRRA organization, everyone that I have talked to said to me that the Poles are not Communists; the Poles are Catholics, the Poles are good Christian people. They cannot make Communists out of the Polish people.

Mr. Chairman, six or seven million of those people died during the war. Five million more would have died if it had not been for UNRRA aid. They need this aid and assistance and they are entitled to it.

The Polish people have gone to work digging coal in the mines. It is one place in all of Europe where production is above prewar production. Coal production is

above prewar coal production in Poland. It is really amazing. They have rolled up their sleeves, they have gone to work. The people are working. There are no strikes over there. They are struggling. They know what condition the whole world is in. They gave of their own coal, thousands of tons of it, to UNRRA for distribution to other countries. UNRRA was distributing Polish coal, mined by Polish workers. Those Polish miners must have clothes. They must be fed so that they can work. Those people are not lazy. They are hard-working people. They are struggling bitterly to reconstruct their land and to rebuild their means of livelihood. Certainly we cannot take the position that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and some other of these gentlemen are taking today and say that we shall deny them aid, because, unfortunately, Joe Stalin's armies happened to run through those countries and taken over control. That is against the will of the people in those nations. Do we not understand that? We cannot let those people starve. We must help them.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Did the gentleman from Michigan hear one word in this Chamber today indicating that they would not be willing to give the people of Poland any relief or even indicating they would not be willing to give the people of Poland every bit of that \$350,000,000 mentioned here instead of approximately 50 cents a person for the persons who have to be helped throughout the world?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I heard language used here that the satellite countries should not receive any of this aid. But what does that mean? You are referring to Poland as a satellite country, are you not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a blank check presented to this House, this is it. This bill comes in here much in the same way that previous bills have come in wherein we are asked to appropriate huge sums and trust to the particular department to use its judgment in the dispensation of those funds.

There is not a Member in this body who does not want to do all he possibly can to assist the starving people throughout the world. This is a relief program on a piecemeal basis. It is a hodgepodge proposition. We know that the relief problem is not limited to those countries which have been named. As a matter of fact, the relief problem in occupied areas, central Europe, Germany, today is very, very serious. The relief problem in China is likewise very serious. What we should be considering today is an over-all relief problem so that we then might intelligently approach the problem as it exists.

Former President Hoover testified that if we were to consider the world-wide relief problem that we would be spend-

ing between \$1,200,000,000 and \$1,500,000,000 within the next year. Obviously, we are going to be called upon to handle the whole problem eventually. Now, why is that not in this bill?

There is one question I want to call attention to. We hear constantly this statement that the need is great, and it is, too, but it is not a question of need. What have we got to supply that need? Mr. Hoover says we can spend \$125,000,000. Now, why appropriate \$350,000,000? But that is what we are asked to do. We cannot, and I challenge anybody on either side to show how we can spend \$350,000,000 the balance of this year.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman says Mr. Hoover said we can spend \$125,000,000. If the gentleman will look on page 59 of the hearings, he will find that Mr. Hoover said we were warranted in authorizing \$350,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I remember that testimony very well. Nevertheless, there has been no showing in the testimony that there is more than \$125,000,000 worth of materials available.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that at the very place mentioned, Mr. Hoover said, "I think you are warranted in authorizing \$350,000,000 if the administration will undertake to carry out the suggestion I have made here"—a whole series of suggestions, which were to carry over to make it last for 2 years, and many of those suggestions have not yet been adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is absolutely right. As a matter of fact, none of them have been adopted.

Mr. KEE. I think if the gentleman will read the bill he will find that at least half of the suggestions are incorporated in the measure itself, and the other suggestions have practically been carried out by the plans of the State Department.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman.

The testimony on this bill occurred last February. Great stress was laid on the fact that the great need was for carrying them for the spring and summer prior to the harvest. Within 3 or 4 months they will be harvesting in some of these countries, and I say there is no justification at this time to appropriate \$350,000,000.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. In lines 7 and 8 of this bill we have this expenditure limited to certain things, among which are fertilizer and seed. I know from personal observation in Europe that the potato crop is being planted right now, the sugar-beet crop is being planted, and the wheat crop and the rye crop will be harvested, as the gentleman says, in the latter part of June and July. In another section of the bill it is stated that no appropria-

tions will be spent after July 30, 1948. I want to know about this appropriation for fertilizer and seed for crops that are already in the ground, that are being planted right now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct. It does not make sense. We should not spend for seed and fertilizer now.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the first section I propose to offer this amendment:

Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other countries.

I believe the time has come for the Congress to designate the countries where relief will be administered. It is true this is not an UNRRA proposition, but certainly it is a matter over which we should have some control. The days of the New Deal blank checks are over.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. If we do that, this is what is going to happen. If we designate specifically in the bill certain countries and certain amounts, then we practically are obligated to give those countries that amount of money, whether or not they live up to the rules and regulations as laid down by our Government. We make the rules. The United States Government makes the rules and if they do not live up to those rules, then we can stop all relief instantly. That is the only reason that that is not inserted in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry, but I do not agree with the gentleman. That does not make sense so far as I am concerned in the light of our experiences with UNRRA. We were going to do all those things, but they were never accomplished.

Mr. BLOOM. UNRRA was an international organization.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, yes, I understand that, too.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree that it can be done but it is on account of the experiences that we have had with UNRRA. I say it is not advisable to do it. There is no reason why you should do it except that you would foreclose yourself from stopping any relief if you legislate that the relief is to go to certain countries in certain amounts, irrespective of what they do.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But we are providing \$15,000,000 that can be expended any place where the administrator might find it necessary outside of those countries I have named.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment does not specify the amounts that are going to any country but merely specifies the countries to which the relief must go?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true in the Greco-Turkish program it has been rec-

commended that we specifically name the countries so that apparently in the matter of assistance there is no objection to naming the countries although what we furnish is conditioned upon their performance?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact also that even though we do name the countries any relief to them is still conditioned upon these later provisions of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Positively.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. What provision of law would it be where, if we should name the countries which are to receive relief, that we would not have the right to rescind because of some action which they might take, and why it would be otherwise if we were not to name them?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BENDER. What percentage of this money would go for administration expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am not able to answer that question. I am sorry.

Mr. VORYS. About \$500,000 for 53 persons. That is the amount that is proposed.

Mr. BENDER. Fifty-three persons to spend \$350,000,000? That is amazing.

Mr. VORYS. Fifty-three additional persons in addition to our missions all over the world.

Mr. BENDER. That is, additional persons?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. How many of the people who are taken off the pay rolls here in Washington will be put on this pay roll over there as experts? That is, people who are being taken off the Interior Department and other departments?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 153, now before the Committee, provides for the authorization of an appropriation of \$350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of devastated countries by the late war. If the first sentence contained in the bill should control, then I am confident many of the members would be inclined to give it their full support. Every Member of the House wants to extend aid, by way of food, clothing, medical supplies, fuel, and other necessary items for people who are hungry and starving, and who are in great need and distress. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my constant desire to aid all those who are in great distress, and which distress has come upon them not by choice, and not by their own invitation.

Mr. Chairman, this pending resolution is far different from the initial sentence, in the resolution. That sentence does not relate all there is to this measure. There is no provision contained in the

pending resolution which announces to what countries, or to what particular people, this aid is to be extended; there is also a complete lack of information, from all of the debate, and from all of the information imparted by the report, as to who will handle this huge sum of money; and, there is a positive lack of any information, given during this debate, as to what group, or agency, or individual or collection of individuals, or what "presumed-to-be-Government-head" in any country, will handle the fund allocated within that country; and, there is no information given to any Member of Congress as to whether this fund will be used to aid, or sustain, the communistic element in any of those countries. In many of those countries in Europe there is no staple government—there is no one with whom our country can deal. And, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no definite information as to whether Russia, which nation has taken a "dog-in-the-manger" attitude toward the United States of America, will or will not participate in the division of this large sum of money. These are some of the reasons, which now present themselves to me, which appear to urge me to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, not only the above statements have a definite bearing upon this question, but coming, quite soon, is another measure whereby we will be asked to make a loan, or a gift, to Greece and Turkey. Both Greece and Turkey may be considered as a recipient of funds under the present resolution—and there can be no doubt but those nations can be included in the allocation of the fund here asked, in the sum of \$350,000,000. The measure which will soon be presented to the House will embrace the huge sum of \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. I wonder how many other nations, in Europe and elsewhere, will finally come in and ask for financial aid either for aid or for the development of their military establishment.

Mr. Chairman, some information has been suggested that the bill to be considered in the future will have much to do with the stamping out of communism in Greece and Turkey. Of course, that sum of money would not scratch the surface in any effort to combat communism in those countries. Recently, the President sought to secure an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to rid the agencies of our own Government from the Communists now upon the pay rolls. That is but one small segment in our country, and relates only to our Federal Government. Of course, if any care had been exercised by the Department heads, in employing the people who work there, there would be no need for the sum of \$50,000,000 with which to eradicate that un-American group from our Federal agencies and departments.

In this brief period, may I say that our Nation has suffered from the ravages of war; we have lost our boys; we have given money, munitions of war, food, and equipment of every character for victory; we have suffered greatly—and in finances, we have been the chief sufferer. Now, it is proposed that we feed, and finance, many of those European countries—and I am confident—and I

am constrained to say—that the United States of America will ever do her full part, but she is unable to continue that program, unless our own people are made to suffer immeasurably thereby. Quite often, it is apparently easy for some people to urge the spending of the people's money—and the instant case is an apt illustration—but the people, those whose money is used for this and other spending purposes, have a voice in such matters. The people are worn out—they are sick and tired—they have given their all to aid. This proposal, here made, without any definite information upon the very material matters involved, is merely another plan to make it hard for our own people to exist in these post-war days. It is my fervent hope that every Member will give most careful consideration to this proposal—and think first of the United States of America, before she is weakened or entirely given away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill before this House in which the Republican majority is called upon to assume the obligations and responsibilities of a bipartisan foreign policy. I think that should be made very clear. We are asked to appropriate money for a relief—a program undertaken by our Government as part of this bipartisan foreign policy. The reason is this: We have heard a great deal about the great heart of the United States. The United States has a great heart, but the United States also has a conscience. The United States also supports her international commitments. The United States made a commitment before the United Nations that, if the United Nations would not go ahead with the UNRRA program, to which we were then the greatest contributor, we would go ahead with the unilateral program to relieve starvation and suffering in the world right now; not yesterday or the day before but right now, within this year 1947. I am very glad to note that no Member who has addressed the House has advocated that in any way we should not comply with that commitment. The debate has all been about the amount and about the conditions which would be established, to carry through our commitment. Accordingly I think it is only fair to our distinguished chairman and to all the members of the committee, including the minority members, that we analyze for a minute just what the Committee on Foreign Affairs did with this bill—just what conditions they established in the bill.

When the committee received the bill as House Joint Resolution 134, the only conditions upon the expenditure of this money which the bill provided were three: First, that the supplies transferred pursuant to the bill would be distributed without reference to race, creed, color, or political belief.

Second, that representatives of the United States press and radio could observe and report freely what was done in the country assisted with the relief; and, third, that the country furnished

relief would give us information as to what was being done with it.

Now, let us see what the committee wrote in as strong conditions. First, that full publicity had to be given in every country which was getting this relief assistance about where it was coming from and all other details. Second, that each country benefited would make the maximum effort itself for its own reconstruction, a very important point in view of the legitimate criticism about this very aspect of the situation.

I was in Greece as recently as December 1946; there I obtained information on Greece's alleged failure to have an adequate taxation policy; on the allegedly improvident use of her gold reserves and of her foreign exchange at certain times; on her oversized civil service; and on other features of the national economy requiring reform before Greece could be said to be doing everything to help herself. Much of this reform has already been undertaken, I understand, but the basic principle for us in extending relief aid to the countries that need it is that we shall be entitled to make these reforms a condition of our granting relief.

A third condition the committee wrote into the bill is that representatives of the Government of the United States should be permitted to supervise the distribution of this relief directly, right on the ground. If we are going to have a bipartisan foreign policy and take the responsibility as the majority in Congress, then we must have a certain amount of faith in the agencies of the United States that are going to carry it out. We cannot assume that the people in the State Department are any less servants of this country than we or any less conscientious or any less honest until we have reason to know they are. In writing the provisions of this bill the committee certainly tried to make them tough, but if the Members can do any better, well and good. I will go along with them so long as it does not impede or stop this relief of essential food. Make the conditions tough but let us not condemn anybody in advance of intent to subordinate the interests of the United States in the bill's administration. Finally, the committee provided expressly that the President had to terminate this relief—he had no discretion—he had to terminate it if the conditions set out in the bill were not complied with. Those are pretty strong conditions, but just to add one further, the committee provided that by concurrent resolution of both houses of Congress at any time the relief could be terminated; and that, Mr. Chairman—and I believe many of the members are lawyers—will be written into every single relief assistance contract made with any country which is to benefit under this act so that they will know it in advance.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, as I understand it, intends to make on-the-spot checks on the relief assistance granted through its own means, through its subcommittees. It intends to observe on the spot, as former President Hoover suggested, how this relief program is being carried out and to bring in a recom-

mendation to Congress that it should be terminated to any country when it is satisfied that the will of Congress, the intention of Congress in the matter of this relief is not being carried out.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Permit me to say to the gentleman that I admire the statement he has made. It shows a knowledge of the subject. For that reason will he tell me whether the statement that has been attributed to former President Hoover that we would have to use possibly \$1,500,000,000 if the program included Turkey and Greece, and whether or not the gentleman from New York is in accord with such statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, the conditions set by former President Hoover in naming that figure but I believe it included other countries; for instance, Germany and Austria, the only countries to which he went on his last trip.

Mr. OWENS. And one other question, whether or not the gentleman would be favorable to the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to the gentleman that the program for Greece and Turkey will be before the Congress for consideration in the near future. I hope it shall be possible for me to vote for it, and I make this statement in the expectation that amendments which I propose to offer will be found possible of adoption by the House; but I would like to make this point perfectly clear, that if this Greek-Turkish aid program is undertaken it will have no duplication with the relief program which is now before us. The former is a reconstruction program with certain phases of economic rehabilitation and military equipment, but the program now before us is a food program dealing with the basic essentials of life. There is no duplication whatever. But I would like to make this perfectly clear, if you are going to give relief, and I think most of us want to, you have got to pass this bill or you will not have anybody to save from communism.

The minority report on this bill was prepared by Members of much greater seniority than I, but I submit, with the greatest deference, that their proposal to offer amendments which will reduce the appropriation in the bill to \$200,000,000 should not prevail. The minority made two main points: One, that the program will terminate as of the end of the year 1947; and, two, that our expectation of getting help from the countries in need from other nations will probably be unfounded. Certainly, as to the latter point, if our expectations are going to be unfounded, we need more, not less, money; and, as to the former, we had an expression in the testimony of a very distinguished witness of the people in the matter of dealing with food, D. A. Fitzgerald, Secretary General of the International Emergency Food Council—on leave from the United States Department of Agriculture—that to supply the basic essentials of food alone in 1947 to

the European countries to be relieved under the bill we will have to spend \$296,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not also true that Mr. Hoover recommended the full figure of \$350,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; Mr. Hoover recommended the full figure in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. Is there any reason why the fund of \$200,000,000 recommended should be increased until definite evidence of need beyond \$200,000,000 is shown? What evidence is there that \$200,000,000 is not enough?

Mr. JAVITS. I may say, when my senior colleague asks that question, that this bill has been pending in the House for over 2 months and it promises to be pending another 2 months before it is finally passed; therefore, you cannot expect emergency appropriations. You have to make plans in advance, which is what this bill does. On the other point, namely, the adequacy of the sum authorized, the expert witness whom everybody relied on before our committee, Mr. Fitzgerald, said that we need \$296,000,000 for food alone in 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with keen interest to all of this debate and I think I would be remiss if I did not mention at this time the character, the hard work, and the honest approach that has been brought to this subject by our beloved and distinguished chairman the gentleman from New Jersey. I do not know of anyone who is more devoted to the principles of humanity, who has more hatred of things which are not American in their concept or in their application than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. I do not know of a man in this House who typifies Americanism more than the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I should like to say that every subject that has been under discussion here this afternoon was considered in all of its ramifications by the committee. There has not been one question posed upon the floor of this House, there has not been one amendment suggested that was not explored, that was not voted upon by the members of the committee. Extensive hearings were conducted and thousands of words of testimony were taken. Everyone who could reasonably be expected to offer anything to the committee in the way of constructive help was heard. The fact, the fundamental fact, and the thing we cannot afford to lose sight of is the certainty that unless we take positive, definite action, millions of human beings will starve. I am not

a sentimentalist. Four years at war have made me more of a materialist than a sentimentalist. But I do think we have a definite obligation to do something and to do it fast.

This program has one thing which preceding programs have not had. This is an American program under American supervision and direction. We are not subject to the vetoes of any other power and we are not subject to the direction of any other nation as to where or how or in what manner this food relief is to be distributed. I think that is a most important point.

You may or may not agree with the choice of the recipient nations to whom this relief is to go; but if I do nothing else I would like to add a word to the remarks of the gentlemen who said: "Let us distinguish between Communist dominated governments and Communist-dominated peoples." Let us not offer our aid and assistance through any channels to those who oppose our order, but let us not, on the other hand penalize those who are made subservient to communism by the bayonets of the Red army at their throats.

We have done everything in committee possible under the circumstances to hedge this program about and to assure that it will be a well-ordered and well-organized program of relief. I am not a slave to either the language of the bill as it now stands or a slave to the report as it stands. I agree with some of my colleagues on the committee and with a great many Members of this House that the bill can probably be well and properly amended. I voted for several amendments in committee that were defeated. It is still my intention to support the bill. I will support amendments which I think will strengthen it; but I did want to make one brief appearance on the floor in behalf of the bill because I do consider that it is not only humanitarian in its purpose, but essential to our continued well-being. UNRRA is ending. The one thing that is not ending is famine, and it will not. If we are to uphold the highest precepts of our Nation, if we are to uphold those principles of humanity which have always distinguished the American Nation, I feel that it is essential that we go along with this bill as properly amended.

In conclusion, and to answer those who fear or appear to fear that some of this aid and assistance may be channeled through the recipient nations into countries where the aid is not needed, I should like to read a brief excerpt from the testimony before the committee in which I questioned Mr. Hoover, and I quote:

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Hoover, through your great experience in this field I should like to hear your considered opinion as to whether or not this program, as it is presently contemplated, and with your suggested amendments, can be depended upon to actually deliver this aid down to the grass roots of the recipient countries without undue fear of diversion of the supplies into the black markets of the countries concerned, or the channeling of the aid from the American people past the individuals who need it and into countries totally unrelated to the subject needs?

Mr. HOOVER. There are a number of problems involved in your question: In the first place, I have never found any difficulty about determining whether food is being taken out of a given country. That is a matter of some inspection at the border which is not difficult to arrange. The passing of consequential amounts of food into channels that go over frontiers is not so difficult.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was wondering whether, in further answer to your question, President Hoover indicated whether he would feel as he does if these amendments were not adopted, or whether you feel that some of his suggestions were adopted.

Mr. JACKSON of California. In answer to the gentleman, I feel that some of his recommendations have been included in the bill, and I will go further and say that some more might well be included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], a member of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my personal tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee. I want to complement him on his wisdom, his forbearance, and his deep understanding, not only of the personalities which compose the committee, but of the human problems which are involved in this bill. I think we are very lucky to have a man of his caliber with us in this body.

I have listened with great interest this afternoon to the various arguments which have been brought up on the floor. I am in agreement with many of them. I am not in agreement with them all. I think it would be easy for us to find many reasons why we should not do this thing: That the relief will go into the hands of the Communists, or that we cannot trust the State Department, or that we do not know that these countries are doing what they can to help themselves. There are plenty of reasons of that sort that we can conjure up. But all of these reasons ignore one signal and overwhelming question: What is the constructive alternative? If we do not give this relief, what will happen? And I think that when we approach that problem we can look at this whole subject, not only in the light of human decency and charity, but in the light of our own national self-interest. I yield to no one in my desire to help feed and clothe these destitute people in Europe, but I suggest to you gentlemen that it will be impossible for us to implement whatever foreign policy we may have, short of isolationism, unless we are dealing with a people who have at least got a bare minimum of existence, who have the basic essentials of life. If we do not have that type of humanity to deal with, then all that we may plan here in Washington with respect to foreign policy will come to naught. If you feel that we must have a constructive foreign policy—perhaps you do not think it should be

President Truman's, but perhaps you feel, nevertheless, that isolationism is not the policy; I personally feel strongly that isolationism is not—then we must have contacts with the rest of the world. How can we have contacts, friendly contacts, fruitful contacts, contacts which will symbolize our own ideas of freedom, if we are dealing with a people who are starving to death?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the minds and hearts of the speakers preceding me have been wandering across the seas all this afternoon. Their hearts have been bleeding for the people of other countries. In the short time allotted me I want to turn your thought and attention to the people of the United States of America for a change and say something for them in closing this debate.

Dean Acheson and the State Department promoted UNRRA, and more money was wasted, three to five times over, than the \$350,000,000 proposed in this bill. I wonder how long the State Department will be able to come down and wave the magic wand and continue to lead this committee and the Congress in their deliberations and help to form their policies, when as an administrative office they have shown absolute incompetence through waste and squandering of the people's money. Out of the \$2,700,000,000 that was given them through UNRRA they have wasted probably \$1,000,000,000, and helped to build up communism to oppress the people of the European countries and of China.

They talked about Dean Acheson and others picking this estimate of \$350,000,000 out of the air. I want to speak for the American taxpayer, and say that it will not be so easy on them or you when you pick the \$350,000,000 out of their pockets. You have been so used to throwing millions and billions around for the past 14 years that you have lost sight of the value of money.

They ask for \$350,000,000 in this bill, but Senator BYRD, a Democrat, says we will probably be called upon to support appropriations for relief in total to the extent of \$15,000,000,000. We are committed to appropriate for relief something like \$1,500,000,000 during the coming year. Can we afford it? Is it not time to give more consideration to the taxpayers of this country, more consideration to preserving their financial solvency in this country, so that we can take care of our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I will be against this bill unless some amendments are offered to it and passed which will give this country control of the distribution and which will cut this bill down to \$100,000,000.

This amount is all they can spend between now and the fall harvest, when they should be able to feed themselves.

Of course, the State Department wants to put in an extra \$250,000,000 more, and they will then keep on spending millions till the money runs out.

There will be opportunities for other aid to be extended through Government departments such as the War Assets;

Then there are many millions of dollars contemplated in further aid for the rehabilitation of foreign countries which will doubtless go through the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank for Reconstruction.

May I call to the attention of the Members of this House that you are acting here only as the agents of 100,000,000 taxpayers, who are going to have to furnish this money. I sometimes wonder what has taken hold of the thinking of the Members of this Congress, or rather, what has so dulled their conception of the value of money.

I realize that for the past 14 years billions have been thrown around by the Government as though no one had to pay the costs piled upon the people by the action of their representatives. It seems to me that the sensibilities of the Members of this House and the appreciation of what it means to vote millions and millions of dollars has been case-hardened and dulled. It seems that we do not fully appreciate the man-hours of work and production it must take to create such savings of hundreds of millions of dollars.

When you vote to appropriate \$350,000,000, as requested in this bill, you are, in fact, compelling all of the people to work extra hours or days for the Government without pay, because the Government takes their earnings in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, some of you get so sympathetic and high-minded for peoples of other countries that you very willingly cast their burdens of making a living on the backs of the American taxpayers in our own country.

I know of no other group of men in the United States who, for the past number of years, have been so liberal with spending the other man's money and loading him down with taxes as has the Congress of the United States. You have allowed billions to be wasted, and probably over a billion dollars which we have paid into UNRRA for relief and foreign countries was wasted by that reckless organization. Millions of it went to strengthen communism in several European countries. I predict that unless restrictions are put on this fund when it is voted this same UNRRA group will show up on the pay rolls to continue their nefarious work and waste of the American taxpayers' money. I have no faith in the State Department on its record in conjunction with UNRRA in being capable and trustworthy for the administration of any relief funds in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give you some authentic figures of just a part of the money we have spent in the last couple of years in our effort to play Santa Claus to the world. When you have read these figures you will have a little better appreciation of how well you have tried to serve the world and how poorly you have served the American Government and the American taxpayers in the past.

First, we are committed to about a billion and a half dollars in relief for 1947. During the war we gave Russia \$11,320,864.109 in lend-lease.

To Russia since VJ-day, \$226,000,000 and yet the State Department further wants to send her some \$25,000,000.

To France since VJ-day, \$411,500,000; to Czechoslovakia, \$174,000,000; to Tito and Yugoslavia something over 33 millions; to Poland, 20 millions.

Under UNRRA we have expended \$2,700,000,000. To Greece, 560 millions; to Italy 500 millions. We have spent nearly a billion in Germany, Austria, and Japan. We gave England \$4,000,000,000 and France \$500,000,000.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. Chairman, through the Export-Import Bank there is earmarked for France \$550,000,000, also another credit line to France of \$650,000,000. For Belgium, \$100,000,000; to the Netherlands, \$293,000,000; to Denmark, \$20,000,000; to Finland, \$35,000,000; Poland, \$40,000,000; to China, \$64,000,000; to Czechoslovakia, \$20,000,000. We gave in relief to China \$750,000,000. Our total lend-lease to China was \$1,543,000,000.

Then, through the Bretton Woods, we set up the International Bank for World Reconstruction, which will make loans to various other nations of the world. This bank has a capital of \$8,000,000,000. The United States Government has underwritten the "lion's share" of \$3,175,000,000.

In addition to this we have set up the Monetary Fund for Stabilization of Currencies capitalized at \$7,300,000,000 of which again, the large sum of \$2,750,000,000 of that capital structure is underwritten by the United States Government. I ask the question, How long will this Congress continue to commit the United States Government to finance the world? We cannot continue to do it without bankrupting our Nation financially.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have made a chart covering what I want to say because I believe it will be easier to see it that way. The reason I did that is because to me it shows a situation that should be presented to the American people. The American people at this time are being asked as taxpayers to furnish \$350,000,000, which they will have to pay, of course, in taxes. But, in addition to that, every time we ship any of these things away we must realize we are also asking the people to make another contribution in the form of higher prices for their groceries. It is becoming a little irritating at times to hear people get up and shed tears because food prices are high, and then turn around and advocate shipping of enormous quantities of the scarcer food products all over the world. Who is making food prices high? I am willing to assume my share of the responsibility but I would just like to have the rest of the people in Washington assume their share of the responsibility. If I vote for this appropriation, surely I should in fairness assume my share of the responsibility for causing higher food prices. If you do, please accept your share of the responsibility.

This chart happens to show the beef situation in the last 25 years. We have heard about how much beef we shipped after World War I. We shipped con-

siderably more than we have in any year since World War II. For practically 25 years we have been a Nation that did not furnish her own beef. We were on an import basis. Yet, all at once we blossom out and tell the world we are going to feed it. You can see what happens. If in 1945 we exported 25 times as much beef as we did in 1944, are you surprised at advances in the domestic market price?

I ask you: Is it any wonder that your wives have difficulty when they go to shop in order to secure a good cut of meat?

Do you realize that in many cases only the choicest cuts of meat are being purchased for export? I read this in an editorial in the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern. I checked it. I asked a representative of a big packer in Chicago the other day why it was that certain buyers only took the choicest cattle. I said, "Can they not buy them much cheaper somewhere else?" He said, "I presume they could but they would have to pay for them." I said, "Don't they have to pay for them if they get them from the United States?" He said, "You will have to use your own judgment, the same as I do."

I do not want them to be misled by a lot of this propaganda about OPA, because there never were any calories in OPA and there never will be. Important food products not exported are bringing at the farm level, a price comparable to the OPA price plus subsidy. If it were not for loans to other countries and for UNRRA shipments many farm products would be at support levels this very hour. The American people are entitled to know this and to know the economic reasons behind the scenes that have put prices at their present level. When the American farmer has not been provided a market for 25 years for a product and all at once we step out and try to feed the world, you can see what effect that has on our own markets, and how much difficulty that makes for our own consumers. They should realize that. They should realize that as one of the reasons why they have to pay more when they buy meat.

I did not show the imports on this chart with reference to pork, because the imports do not amount to much. But you can see here the large percentage of American pork that is being exported during the last year. Our exports in the fiscal year 1945 were nine times the amounts exported in 1941. Pork exports are not as much as they were after World War I, but it is a large amount when you consider the increase in the number of people in the United States in 1947. When you take this amount of pork off the American market you can see the effect that has on the meat counters. From 1920 to 1930 we exported one and one-half to two billion pounds of pork each year. In 1945-46 fiscal we exported 600,000,000, and this dropped to 159,000,000 in 1935 and to 253,000,000 in 1941. In 1945 we exported 2,221,000,000 pounds, so you can see the effect that has had on the meat counters of America. If it is good policy to do it, the American people should

know they are paying for it first in taxes, and they should know they are paying for it in their grocery bills, they should not be misled into thinking that it is done by some magic or that it is just picked out of thin air. No one can boast about feeding the world and giving the farmer high prices and then complain about the food prices at the grocery stores of our land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are more or less troubled about this legislation. I know of no one who wants to withhold aid from people who are hungry. There are some things I cannot understand. I notice the plea has again been made by one of the distinguished members of this committee that there should be no amendments offered to this bill. I recall that when the UNRRA bill was before the House the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], now the ranking Member of the minority on the committee, made the same strong plea. I was one of those who then protested against UNRRA. I said I was in favor of helping in a relief program, but I thought if the United States of America was to furnish 72 percent of the money, we should have something to say about how and where it was spent. But the gentleman held up his hands in holy horror and said: "No; we must not amend the bill." We now know by sad experience that our contribution should have been safeguarded.

I find now that there has been considerable change in sentiment. I find now, after American dollars and American goods, representing approximately 72 percent of all of UNRRA, were going into some of these countries that are encased behind the so-called iron curtain and the people of those countries were told it was benevolent Russia that was furnishing the relief, we could not even get into those countries to see how the funds were being administered. It might have been well to have had some safeguards in the legislation at that time. The people of this country who are paying the bill are entitled to know how their money is being used.

I recall very well that amendments were offered to the UNRRA bill through which we would permit the press to go into those countries and publicize the things that were going on, but the same gentlemen who now say, "No, no; we must not amend this bill" objected strenuously to any amendments along that line and so we find today, that our communist ally made good use of Uncle Sam's money and commodities in promoting their own ideologies, knowing that the Congress of the United States had refused to permit their activities to be given the bright light of publicity. And I want to pause here long enough to say that I do not go quite so far as some who would permit the people in some of these communistic countries to starve, just because they happen to be under communistic influence. It may

not be their fault. And so I do not think we should say to them "No, we cannot feed you because the communists control you." I certainly would not want some administrator to point to some fellow and say, "Well, you happen to live out in a communist ward; for that reason we are going to let you starve to death." Certainly we should see to it that none of our relief funds or goods are turned over to communistic governments or communist administrators and I assume we have now had enough experience that we have learned our lesson.

The thing I cannot understand is why this committee did not give more heed to the recommendations made by Mr. Hoover. I know, of course, that Mr. Hoover at one time was very unpopular with my friends over here on the right, but the present President of the United States has found it necessary to call on Mr. Hoover's great ability and experience in handling relief and has commissioned him to go over into Europe on two occasions in the past 2 years and make a report to the President.

Mr. Hoover came back with a report. Mr. Hoover did not say that he thought the State Department should be given a blank check to handle this relief matter; no, no; Mr. Hoover made among other suggestions that further careful study be made of the need for this relief in each of these countries and that the relief should be made after full consideration and examination on the ground by specialists appointed by the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the International Emergency Food Council.

He goes on further to say that the distribution should be continually under the supervision of and satisfactory to specialists from these same agencies.

But for some reason I do not understand, this great committee saw fit to ignore that suggestion of Mr. Hoover and they have said, "No, we are just going to give a blank check for \$350,000,000 to the State Department." Certainly in my opinion the State Department has never exhibited any great administrative ability. The State Department is not an administrative agency, it is a policy-making agency. Yet we are asked to pass this bill without amending it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me another 5 minutes?

Mr. EATON. My time has expired, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me that minute?

Mr. EATON. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot yield right now.

One reason I am a little bit skeptical about turning the distribution of these funds over to the State Department is that I do not believe that the State Department under UNRRA has done too good a job in protecting relief funds. I

have a letter here I intended to read but time will not permit, where the State Department through UNRRA permitted UNRRA relief funds to be used to buy 21 transport planes at a cost of approximately \$5,000,000. Those planes were turned over to a Chinese relief organization and the Chinese relief organization in turn, turned the planes over to General Chennault. General Chennault has established a commercial air line with these planes that were purchased with UNRRA funds to the tune of \$5,000,000. I have a letter here from UNRRA. The general is going to pay for those planes how? In the use of his commercial air line he is going to distribute some UNRRA relief and at a price that he is going to fix with the Chinese Government, pay for the planes in services. He will become the owner of this commercial air line, paid for by the relief funds, made available by the taxpayers of this country who thought their tax dollars were to be used to feed and clothe hungry people.

I think this bill should have some safeguarding amendments.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of certain references which have been made this afternoon to former public officials, particularly the reference just indulged in by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, about the attitude of certain people on this side of the aisle toward former President Hoover, it occurs to me that it might be appropriate to conclude the debate on this side by reading a brief statement I made to President Hoover, and, incidentally, I was the only man on the committee, Democrat or Republican, who addressed him as "Mr. President" instead of "Mr. Hoover," when he was before our committee:

Mr. President, the chairman very appropriately referred to you, in introducing you, in some such language as "the outstanding authority in the world on relief."

While I have no question, I wish to express to you my deep appreciation, which I feel sure is shared by the people of the United States generally, of your great accomplishments, not only in the immediate past but after World War I, and what I am sure you are destined to do in the future, not only directly for suffering humanity, but indirectly, in view of the good will and other benefits coming to this country for your own countrymen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, does it seem at all logical or reasonable for a committee, the majority of the membership of which I believe feels toward President Hoover just as I expressed there, to wave aside blandly his recommendations without good reason? No, it is not logical, Mr. Chairman. All these matters, as I said before, were thoroughly discussed and thoroughly considered. The bill was considerably amended and the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought to the House a bill which the majority of its Members on both sides of the aisle believe to be for the best interest of this country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I like the remarks the gentleman made concerning ex-President Hoover. Is the gentleman in accord with what he stated there, namely, that he believes in order for funds to be administered sufficiently and economically we should appoint an administrator to administer that fund?

Mr. JARMAN. That is passingly strange, coming from the gentleman. On the gentleman's side of the aisle you have talked about bureaucrats all of these years and I imagine still are; yet you want to create a bureaucracy to run this relief program which is comparatively small. No. I want the State Department, which has embassies in all those countries, to supervise this program, under the direction of the President, who I imagine will designate an excellent and able administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has observed my position in regard to international affairs and the foreign policy of this Government well knows my position in regard to these matters.

I have frankly admitted that I have been confused and could not understand what I considered as so many inconsistencies in our actions and policies since, and during the last World War.

Some of my criticisms were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title of "Santa Claus" and so forth, and like my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], who has just preceded me, I have time and again claimed that we should think about of our own country, our taxpayers, and not continue to give the resources and substance of our country away to other countries, and have long ago called attention to the fact that it was time for the peoples of all of these other countries to go to work and do something for themselves.

Of course, I have not been opposed to render such aid as was possible to starving peoples, within the limitations of our resources without depriving our own people, and, while I know the vast majority of the American people approved of such programs by the Government, and many thousands participated in relief by charitable and religious organizations, I have doubted the wisdom and the ability of 6 percent of the world's population being expected to continue to feed the balance of the world indefinitely.

It is true that I voted for appropriations for UNRRA for relief to countries devastated by war; however, I was shocked by the manner of administration of this program, and it is not necessary to reiterate what every Member of Congress knows in respect to the administration of that program.

Only yesterday during debate on the rule on the bill H. R. 153 now under consideration, my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN], in discussing our aid to other countries, brought an admission from one of our

colleagues who is considered to be fully informed on the subject "that about \$1 out of every sixty actually goes to the place it is intended for."

Mr. Chairman, in justice to our constituents who have to pay the taxes for such programs, how can we continue to vote millions of dollars when administered in this fashion? And for how much longer and for how much more will we be called upon in the future?

Mr. Chairman, while I feel certain that the bill under consideration will pass, I do hope that amendments will be adopted which will at least protect us against a repetition of the waste in former programs, and that this country will at least obtain credit for furnishing the aid and relief and accomplish the end for which it is claimed.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution because I believe that we must utilize every resource to relieve human want in the distressed areas of the world. We have expended billions in a war to preserve our institutions and we cannot be indifferent to potential threats related to the misery which the appropriation is designed to alleviate.

The Government will not be asked to continue this program indefinitely. The Foreign Affairs Committee gives us an encouraging picture of progress but leaves no doubt in my mind as to the urgency of the current appeal. I am confident that the people will approve our action in authorizing this aid. Our own national interests are vitally involved.

At the same time we do not discount the humanitarian element in this program. We would have to renounce one of our finest traditions to hold that the suffering in foreign countries is not an official concern of the American people. The problem is too great to be solved outside of governmental enterprise.

The minimum safeguards are in the bill. I believe it will be constructively administered. I know that will be true if we stick to our emphasis upon "helping people to help themselves."

As a device for stabilizing conditions and building good will for America as well as conserving human values the program embraced in this resolution should be approved.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am of course moved by the humanitarian considerations contained in this bill. No one is more anxious than I to do what I can to alleviate human suffering and the awful hunger and despair that has followed in the wake of the great war.

I realize also that communism feeds on human misery; that if the democratic countries desert the overriden peoples of the world, these peoples may feel that they have no place to turn except to communism. I cannot, however, see us take this step without expressing my own reservations.

First of all, I do not want to see us pour relief into one frontier of commu-

nistic-dominated countries, while Russia shovels it out on another frontier.

Secondly, we are now confronted with the greatest war debt in the history of the world, and we are forced to take account of our own economy.

Thirdly, we face tremendous responsibilities to our veterans, and I, for one, am going to insist that they be fully met. Need I call attention to the fact that my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has introduced a bill to provide for the immediate cash payment of terminal-leave bonds? I am happy to state that I was one of the very first to sign the petition to bring this bill to the floor. After all these weeks the bill still lacks the necessary signatures.

Fourthly, are we going to do anything about our old-age-assistance program? It seems to me to be high time that we took care of our own old people. Numerous bills to correct this situation have been introduced. When can we expect one of these measures to come to the floor?

What are we going to do for soil conservation, for our crop-insurance program next year? What are we going to do about our long-standing obligations to our Indian citizens?

I cannot say that there is no need for this foreign-relief bill. Nor do I have any doubt but that our great President will see to it that it is administered in such a way as to enhance the cause of humanity, of democracy, and of American idealism throughout the world. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the fact that we have obligations to our own people, obligations to our own country. It must remain, as it has been for all these years, the greatest Nation in all the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, such relief assistance to be limited to the following: Food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a very illuminating and instructive debate here today. It is very evident that it will be impossible to deal properly with the great mass of amendments that are pending this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I might suggest that I have consulted the minority leader, and I announce at this time that if the Interior Department appropriation bill is concluded on Friday, we will go over until Monday. Our plan is, of course, to take up the Interior Department appro-

priation bill tomorrow, and so we have agreed to put this matter over until Monday, as the gentleman from New Jersey so well says, in order that the amendments may be considered at that time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST LEON JOSEPHSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 192, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to be sworn and to testify on March 5, 1947, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpoena served upon him on March 5, 1947, and his willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal to be sworn and to testify before the same subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities after he had appeared before it on March 5, 1947.

The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 190, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Leon Josephson to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpoena served upon him on February 4, 1947.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST EUGENE DENNIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Resolution 193, Eightieth Congress, he did, on today, April 23, 1947, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful, deliberate, and inexcusable refusal of Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis Waldron, to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to the subpoena served upon him on March 26, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an American Legion essay.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT and Mr. GAVIN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

A SUGGESTION REGARDING THE GREEK LOAN PROBLEM

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered before this House on March 12, by the President of the United States, has been acclaimed by some as the outstanding statement of a new American world policy. It has been condemned by other people as an invitation to disaster not only for the United States, but for world civilization and world order. It should be obvious, Mr. Speaker, that any message, on any subject, which has in itself the power to invite such divergent opinions, warrants the close and careful scrutiny of the Congress. We must recall the law of true statesmanship, that panic never creates policy.

In writing a weekly letter to the newspapers, immediately after the delivery of the message, and attempting to set down my first reactions to the President's message, one of my comments was that the President himself seemed to be more nervous than should have been expected under the circumstances. Some observers, both here and abroad, have commented that the tone of the President's message seemed to reveal a state of panic. I am not entirely sure that I agree with the comment, and certainly a state of panic is not warranted by the facts of the present world power situation.

I base that statement, Mr. Speaker, and my following arguments on the fundamental fact, to which every thoughtful person will agree, but which has been permitted to become more and more obscure since Potsdam, namely, that the Soviet Union is an economic and industrial vacuum rather than a big power ready for any new war.

The fact that Mr. Stalin, and the other players on the red squares of the international chess board, have been permitted a certain amount of success with their propaganda—or, in the words of a country in which poker is a national pastime, their bluff—should not blind democratic people everywhere in the world to the basic fact that the Kremlin has every reason to think twice before it oversteps the weak line of defense which the devastation of a long and cruel war has left the USSR. I am sure every military expert will agree with my contention that it is preposterous for a mighty and peace-loving United States to cringe before the rumblings of a propaganda machine from a weakened postwar Moscow.

If we keep in mind this basic fact of present world power politics, I then submit, Mr. Speaker, that the ever recurring "emergency situations" with which the executive branch of this Government continues to present us, reveal a basic weakness in the present administration's

over-all approach to problems of foreign affairs. Evidence accumulates to show that the present administration is panicky, confused, and short-sighted in the way it is handling foreign relations of the United States. Frankly, it would seem as though the State Department is never satisfied unless it can stagger continuously from one crisis to another crisis, and from one emergency to another emergency. The poorly prepared always hide their confusions behind the cry, "Emergency."

The total destruction—moral, financial, psychological, and industrial—which World War II brought to this sad world, will remain for years as a challenge to our common labor of reconstruction. No sane student of postwar world affairs would deny that for a moment. You and I will not deny it, Mr. Speaker. This broken world is not going to be rebuilt in a year or two. This uphill work, to set the world going again, will surely be confronted with emergency world situations which must be met with long-range and well-thought-out remedial action by all the nations which look hopefully toward peace.

Admitting this obvious and tragic fact does not imply, however, that the Congress of the United States will blindly foot all the bills of such present and future "emergency situations" which our State Department announces as foreboding the end of the world, or at least as the ultimate crises in American history. The greatest power on earth cannot permit itself to fall into such cheap melodrama.

So we turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the President's request of March 12, for \$400,000,000 of American taxpayers' money to protect and reestablish the democratic way of living in Greece and in Turkey. It is necessary to examine the stated purposes of this emergency aid. The reason given by Mr. Truman for the urgent need of this American assistance was the fact that if we did not step in where Great Britain is pulling out both Greece and Turkey would fall prey to the insidious expansion of communism, under the direction of Moscow. I am as militantly opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the blackmailing and to the undermining of other nations by our former ally, the Soviet Union, as is any Member of this Congress. I cherish the hope that, by the grace of God, the present human suffering everywhere in the world will teach the peoples of the world the way of peace and the road to freedom. If this issue could be decided on the basis of moral emotions alone, I would immediately cast an affirmative vote for this emergency gift to the two nations around the Dardanelles. I submit however, Mr. Speaker, that \$400,000,000 is an amount which the present administration has arrived at by a sheer arbitrary guess. Military experts have indicated to me, and to other Members of this Congress, that if we have any thought of doing a real job, from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf, we had better be prepared to spend \$4,000,000,000, rather than \$400,000,000, for such a purpose. Once again it seems to me that Congress is being asked to underwrite

the guesswork of the executive branch of this Government.

But staggering as these figures are, to be taken from the tax moneys of the American people, and concerned as I am on the practical issue of the ability of this Nation to keep on supporting the world, what gives me the greatest and most genuine concern is the fundamentally false philosophy which seems to underline the whole thinking of the present administration on world affairs. We are still being asked to believe that we can buy friendship. We are supposed to accept the idea that we can purchase freedom with dollars. We are to believe that when we are asked for help by a distressed neighbor that it is enough for us to draw a check and mail it to him. We are supposed to believe that the spiritual and moral battle against Communist tyranny can be settled in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to keep on living in the valley of lend-lease. I want to move out. I think every thoughtful Member of this Congress wants to move out. This is certainly one place where we are not required to keep on living where we do not want to live because of a housing shortage, also created by the policies of the administration. We should arm ourselves with moral and spiritual power and unite freedom-loving nations everywhere on the battlefield of liberty, decency, and international understanding.

If the representatives of the Moscow Government wish to continue their mad and treacherous blocking of all recovery and reconstruction of this postwar era, then why do we not go before the United Nations General Assembly and identify the Moscow Government as the potential, if not the actual, enemy, not only of the democracies in fact, but of human liberty everywhere in the world? The time has come to put Mr. Molotov and Mr. Gromyko in the international isolation ward.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Divine Providence has made the United States of America the strongest Nation on the earth today for reasons which we ourselves may not yet see clearly, but in which we have great and enduring faith. I reject the shallow philosophy which dominates the State Department. American world leadership must have a much more profound meaning than simply for the United States to be the banker for a defunct imperialism, once dominated by the British Empire, or to be a sort of petty-cash purveyor of emergency funds, for nation after nation, irrespective of the actual needs of the nations themselves. We must take the dollar sign off of our world policy, not because the United States is unwilling to carry whatever part may be decided to be ours, in bringing peace to the world, but because a petty-cash foreign policy, even to the New Deal tune of staggering billions, is absolutely out of tune with the real challenge of the present world era.

Either we will begin to lead the world in terms of spiritual and political ideas, or we will continue to throw our money, in terms of billions of dollars, out of the

window to an ever-expanding world WPA.

The philosophy of the New Deal did not work at home. The present administration would like to have us believe that it will work abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the approach of the present administration to world affairs is in reality cheapening the reputation of America all over the world. I would like to have the policy makers of our State Department come out of their secret chamber, where they keep themselves hidden away from the representatives of the American people. I would like to know who they are and I would like to know what their objectives are, and above all I would like to be told why they think that these policies, proven failures at home, have any chance of success merely because they are to be tried on an international scale.

Let our so-called foreign policy experts listen to the following statement, made by the executive directors of the International Monetary Fund, in their annual report of September 1946. This is what they say:

The road ahead is not an easy one. Although foreign aid has been of great assistance, it is important to recognize that recovery has depended and will continue to depend primarily on their own efforts.

The tragedy of Greece is that the heroic people, whose heroism blends into every preceding era in the history of the world, never had a chance, under the imperialistic system, to govern their own affairs. The attitude of the representatives of Great Britain in postwar Greece was, in the words of people who have been in that country recently, an insult to the democratic spirit, and a damper on the independence to which that nation is entitled. We as Americans abhor the idea that when a situation in any nation has developed into such a mess that it threatens world security, it should then become the burdensome duty of the United States to send in another set of WPA administrators. Frankly, if three centuries have not taught the British Government how to cope with such a situation, what wonderland of maladministration can we not expect from our Paul Porters or our Ed. Pauleys, trained in the school of propaganda, politics, and extravagance, familiar to everyone in this room who has been in Washington during any part of the last decade.

That alternative does not tempt me, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, I am here today to warn this Congress that Greece has suffered, and suffered enough. We owe it to the Greek people to realize that the untold suffering of that nation should make us very hesitant before we turn Greece into a strategic arena, where two diametrically opposed world powers are to draw their battle lines. Human consideration, and statesmanship under the terms of the Republic which made this Nation great, cannot afford to look upon the homeland of a great little nation as nothing but a geopolitical area of power politics.

Of course, Mr. Dean Acheson has assured us that the American unilateral action in Greece is not likely to bring us into war with the Soviets. But then,

Mr. Acheson does not have a reputation for being among the accredited major prophets. I also recall that during the discussion over the British loan, some months ago, Mr. Acheson admitted to a feeling that it was not necessary to supply the Congress with full details on matters of this kind. I would be much more inclined to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this Congress listen for a moment to words of the world's press and the world's radio. Not being a Henry Wallace, I take no interest in what the Communist world's press is shouting. The immoral obstructionism of the Communists, and of their fellow travelers, in this country or elsewhere, deserves no hearing in the halls of freedom. What I am worried about is the fact that both conservative and genuinely liberal newspapers and radio voices are warning us that the Truman doctrine is neither practical nor healthy. For example, the Hilversum radio—in Holland—says this:

The President's address was nothing short of an ideological and economic declaration of war on the Soviet regime.

The Stockholm radio commented as follows on the speech:

The United States initiative will hardly contribute to peace and relaxation.

A commentator on the Schwarzenburg radio—in Switzerland—pointed a finger at the never ending inconsistency of United States foreign policy, in the following observation:

A few weeks ago, the United States refused to grant a loan to Greece of twenty-five millions. Today they offer her ten times as much and even extend their generosity to neighboring Turkey. The American Government seems to be very fond of this kind of change, which fringes on the theatrical.

The Shanghai radio summarized its views in the following not-very-complimentary words:

It seems that Truman has asked for an America-first policy, whatsoever be the risk involved.

While in France, even a De Gaullist paper like L'Orde, which certainly does not harbor any Communist sympathies, warned:

We don't think that Truman's speech can serve the cause of international peace.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Congress could, of course, take the rash attitude that we do not care what other nations think or say; that we are interested in American security, come what may. Such an attitude would fit the picture given by the Montreal Star, when it says, in an editorial:

The United States action is regarded here as being strictly in the field of power politics.

Speaking of power politics, let me point out that even British spokesmen are not too sure about the possible success of our new departure in world affairs as proclaimed by the Truman doctrine. The Daily Telegraph of London, which has supported the policies of imperialism, interpreted the Truman speech as follows:

The President's message constitutes a complete vindication of British policy in Greece.

God forbid that this Nation should ever come to be identified, in the minds of free peoples, with the exploitation and the snobbery which has followed imperialism, wherever it went. If the British record in Greece is to require vindication, let it not come from the free shores of the United States, a Nation founded by men and women who sought to escape the tyrannies and the restrictions of the Old World and who set up in the New World a Nation dedicated to freedom which has since served as a beacon light for all other peoples.

I much prefer, Mr. Speaker, to agree with the cautious words of the Manchester Guardian, which said:

It would be absurd and unworthy for us to condemn the United States for trying to do what we have failed to do.

I must ask: Why does the President insist on having the United States take over a failure, a bankruptcy? What hope have we that we will be more successful in carrying out a policy that has proven itself a failure? I can already hear the loud answer: Ah, but we are wealthier than the British; we are stronger than all nations; we can be just as tough as Mr. Stalin and his gang.

I must therefore ask in all sincerity, Is this the history of America? Is this, in fact, the American way? More than that, I must ask, very seriously, does this unilateral policy, pronounced by the President, conform with our pledge to uphold and strengthen the United Nations? I shall return in a moment to that vital question.

I want first to point out two related sets of facts: First, I want to remind the Members of the Congress that the spokesmen for this administration have been bad guessers so often that I for one see no reason at all to accept their present arguments, in favor of Greece and Turkey, as infallible, or even justified by the facts? Let me point out briefly that these spokesmen for the administration were wrong in their guesses on the effects of the Bretton Woods Agreement. How many Members recall the definite statement on this floor that the passage of the Bretton Woods Agreement would make loans to individual countries unnecessary?

How about the administration's guesses regarding the effects and significance of the loan to Britain or the loan to China? The former was to solve at once the problem of the sterling bloc, and the latter was to keep China on an even keel. In fact, let me comfort and encourage the Members of this Congress with the thought that our own guesses are at least as good as the guesses of the administration experts have turned out to be. Could it not be, in the present case, that the political experts of England, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, China, and France, quoted above, are quite as well-informed regarding world trends as are our own so-called experts? Prudence leads me to suggest that such may well be the case.

I am sure that we must all agree with the Hilversum—Holland—radio, when it

sizes up the real problem before us in the following excellent statement:

The crux of the whole issue is whether or not the United States will be able to stamp out misery, hunger, starvation, and squalor in those countries that have now become American protectorates to all intents and purposes.

Now, I would ask frankly, Mr. Speaker, if we have ever begun to fathom what misery, hunger, starvation, and squalor World War II has left us with? Have we seen these countries in what would be considered normal times; can we visualize them now, in the wake of war? Do we really pretend, even to ourselves, to believe that the United States alone can stamp out this world-wide misery? Do we wish to see more and more parts of the globe turned into American protectorates?

Mr. Speaker, I reject imperialism of any kind; above all I reject the Red imperialism to which President Roosevelt bowed supinely at Tehran and at Yalta. And so I reject the false idea that what the sick and broken world now needs is an America with a check book in one hand, and supporting with the other hand a world imperialism which is slipping from the weakening hands of the British Empire. The Truman doctrine is both false and un-American.

The second set of facts is concerned with the economic side of the problem.

As practical people, we Americans have long since begun to recognize the fact that the United States cannot keep up this mad flow of dollars, east and west and everywhere. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that as of this date we have given away the following staggering amounts:

To UNRRA.....	\$3,000,000,000
To Great Britain.....	3,750,000,000
To France.....	1,300,000,000
To China.....	500,000,000
To the International Bank.....	2,750,000,000
To the Monetary Fund.....	1,500,000,000
Total.....	12,800,000,000

To this I add, and I am sure I add it with your full agreement, Mr. Speaker, the sum of \$31,000,000,000, spent on lend-lease, which gives us the staggering total of \$43,800,000,000. And in a few years, our occupation expenses, to which we are obligated, will increase this amount to something in excess of \$50,000,000,000, a combination of digits and ciphers which, prior to the advent of the New Deal, was thought to be reserved exclusively for the use of astronomers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this House should challenge my designation of these moneys as "gifts," I can only say that I meant no offense, but that my memory of post-World War I loans is still good, and that, furthermore, there are quite a few items I have omitted from my list; for example, the running expenses of UN, or the constantly recurring amounts, in current appropriation bills, covering expenditures that we thought, and often, are told, are concluded. In addition, I submit earnestly that, in my opinion—and I suspect in the opinion of most of us in the Congress—these \$400,000,000 asked for Greece and

Turkey will not only fail to meet the demands upon us for that particular area, but may well be only the beginning of a list of gifts, the scale of which might run somewhat as follows:

To Greece.....	\$250,000,000
To Turkey.....	150,000,000
To Korea.....	600,000,000

And I interrupt my accounting, Mr. Speaker, to remind you that the representatives of Korea say that they have already been promised this loan by the President; and to remind you that what Turkey is reported to want is not money, but help in modernizing her army and her agriculture—

To China, an additional....	\$1,000,000,000
To Austria.....	250,000,000
To Hungary.....	150,000,000
To the East Indies.....	100,000,000
To France.....	1,000,000,000
To Italy.....	1,000,000,000
To Palestine.....	250,000,000

And finally, Mr. Speaker, if the earlier habits of the New Deal, and of this administration, and of the preceding administration, have set any precedents, or given us any historical background, we will probably start down the list again; so I will, as a reminder, add a second loan to Greece, in the same amount:

To Greece, second loan.....	\$250,000,000
-----------------------------	---------------

Which makes a grand total, not included in my first list, of \$5,000,000,000.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that I have carefully refrained from adding that \$1,000,000,000, which has been talked of as a new loan to the Soviets. After all, we did not get much return, in the way of friendship, from our \$11,000,000,000 in lend-lease gifts to Mr. Stalin and his Politburo, an embarrassing fact which seems at this very moment to be troubling a distinguished Member of the other body. Furthermore, if the U. S. S. R. is so well-to-do that it can now afford, as the papers reported, to offer a loan to the British, not to mention the 500,000 tons of wheat which it took from the allegedly impoverished Russian people to send to the Communist leader, Thorez of France, I think that I meet with the consensus of opinion of this House when I omit that nation from my list.

In conclusion, the Republican Party served this Nation well by having the senior Senator from Michigan, a distinguished member of the United States delegation to the conferences of the United Nations, remind the President and his advisers of the fact that the United Nations was erected to make all nations cooperate for peace and reconstruction.

I am convinced that this is the crisis in the life of the United Nations. I have been to Geneva. I was there in 1937 on the day when the representative of China, the Honorable Wellington Koo, presently the ambassador of that nation to our Nation, made his plea to the League of Nations. I recall the encroachments into the Ruhr and the weakness of the League of Nations; I can see again the rape of China by Japan and I can hear, in my memory, only conversation from Geneva.

I can see Mussolini's legions invade Ethiopia; what a glorious revival, on a puppet scale, of the glories that once were Rome's, to conquer with modern weapons, the bare-foot and spear-armed troops of Hali Selassie. What fun it was, do you remember, to drop bombs on the natives from a plane and see them blown into the air like the petals of a flower. The impotence of the League of Nations was obvious to all the world. I do not want that to happen now. After serious meditation, however, I feel that the Vandenberg amendment does not go to the root of the present problem. I propose that Congress postpone any decision on the President's request for assistance to Greece and Turkey for the time being and, in the meantime, that Congress request the following steps be taken in this vital matter:

First. That a sum of not more than \$50,000,000 be given immediately to Greece, to reestablish sound money in that exploited country, and to make such relief and reconstruction purchases as are necessary to carry her people over the next few critical months; and

Second. That the Greek Government present immediately to the United States an honest and long-range rehabilitation plan for Greek economy and Greek industry; and

Third. That the United States present to the General Council of the United Nations in September a challenge to have all member nations come to the assistance of Greece, a nation—itsself—which fought the Fascists and the Nazis, and which now finds itself threatened by a foreign-inspired Communist revolution; and

Fourth. That if the General Council does not bring the case of Greece before the UN Security Council, the United States itself do so, and demand that the Soviet veto be declared unlawful if a majority vote in the Security Council shall invite the United States and other democratic nations to defend Greek freedom against totalitarian communism; and finally

Fifth. That the United States, while waiting for such practical and positive action by the United Nations in September, order adequate United States naval forces to patrol the eastern Mediterranean this summer, to keep peace in those waters for the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these suggestions to the Republican leadership in both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to the proper committees of both Houses, particularly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to the Subcommittee on State of the Committee on Appropriations, of this House in which I now speak.

I submit them, also, to that jury which will decide the answers for all of us, to the voters of the United States, the very future of which, as a free nation, may well hang upon the slender thread of this decision.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Did the gentleman from California include also the \$15,-

000,000,000 that Wallace recommended that we give Russia?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have not come to that. I will see how much that now makes my list. Does the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin think Russia is going to get that on Mr. Wallace's suggestion?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I hope not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that Turkey is reported not to want money but to want help in modernizing her army and her agriculture.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 173, Rept. 299), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions; and

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress; and

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other; and

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee on foreign aid composed of 15 Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, 10 of whom shall be selected as follows: 1 from among the majority members and 1 from among the minority members of each of the following committees: the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Agriculture. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a continuing study of (1) actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs; (4) the administrative skills and performance of such agencies; (5) continuing wartime or other controls, if any, required to maintain prices of commodities in short supply at reasonable levels, whether such controls be domestic or international; (6) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but not less often than once in each 6 months.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether

or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, or employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary.

THE TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as everyone in the House knows, I am completely opposed to the military alliance with Turkey proposed by the State Department to the House. I am opposed to pouring American taxpayers' money into every corrupt dictatorial government everywhere in the world that may say that it is against communism, provided we will dump good, American dollars into their lap. I have pointed out that the Turkish Government is in an excellent financial position—better than we are, as a matter of fact. I have pointed out their age-old violation of sworn commitments. I have pointed out, too, their persecution of Christians and Jews for the past thousands of years. I have pointed out that even while we have been considering the bill to give aid to Turkey, they have violated one of the provisions of that bill, namely, the provision which guarantees the freedom of the press.

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not complete my objections to this bill. On this floor I have said that the present Turkish Government is a dictatorial government. Now, our State Department knows that, Mr. Truman knows it, everybody knows it—everybody who has taken the trouble to examine the facts. I have inquired from the Library of Congress and from a variety of sources, including the Turkish Embassy, to find out how many people voted in the so-called elections that they had in 1946, and I have discovered that nobody in the city of Washington, including the State Department, the Turkish Embassy, the Library of Congress, knows how many people voted in Turkey. Is not that interesting? For every other country in Europe it is possible to obtain the election figures. You can find out how many people voted in every single country in Europe, except Turkey. Nobody knows how many people registered, how many people were eligible, or how many people voted.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman trust the figures that may have been given in the matter of the votes in such a country as Yugoslavia?

Mr. BENDER. At least they have figures, but we have no figures for Turkey. I would not say that I trust the figures from the present Yugoslavian Government too much, but we do have the figures, and the figures are available in the Library of Congress. We have no figures at all given us from Turkey.

Mrs. BOLTON. Perhaps we have not asked in the right way.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of a single party government the present Turkish dictatorship decided to license an opposition party in 1946. Some of the leaders of the party which had ruled Turkey for 20 years were sent out to set up an opposition party. Other political groups were considered to be subversive, and they were suppressed. Only the so-called Democratic Party—all of its leadership coming from the single party which had ruled Turkey for 20 years—was permitted to exist. Then in the summer of 1946 elections were held for the Turkish National Assembly. I believe that the House would like to hear what the Newsweek magazine of May 27, 1946, reported on that election:

When the Democrats began to organize, however, they ran into trouble. They accused civil authorities of preventing them from setting up headquarters on a nationwide scale. They declared provincial state governors refused to allow Democratic rallies, and constantly intercepted mail and telephone messages. They said policemen beat up their followers. Finally, as a protest, they issued a manifesto declaring the Government nondemocratic, and decided they would boycott both municipal and national elections. President Inonu seized upon this action to imply that the Democrats were actually Communists who wanted to discredit the Turkish Government in the eyes of other states. He promised Turkey would fight political parties inspired from abroad and acting as foreign instruments.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we have a government, a dictatorship for 20 years, which set up an opposition party, hand-picked its leadership, and the very moment that the new opposition party began to raise any real question about conditions in Turkey, they were called Communists. Imagine the political atmosphere which must exist in a country where a political party which advocates free enterprise is labeled communistic.

The blunt and brutal fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the present Turkish Government is an out and out dictatorship without civil liberties and without political liberties of any kind. The record demonstrates this.

Mr. Speaker, why does our State Department ask us to form a military alliance with a government which they know to be a dictatorship? Why does our State Department have the audacity to tell the Congress that Turkey is on the road to democracy? Why does our good President, Mr. Truman, expect us to pour the American taxpayers' money into a corrupt dictatorship?

Mr. Speaker, the policy does not make sense. It offends the common sense of the ordinary American citizen—the policy is one which leads to war. It is a policy of intervention throughout the world—it is a policy which destroys the United Nations. This Congress should repudiate the short-sightedness of Mr. Truman and of his State Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Colonel Johnson, and also a chart, if under the rules the chart may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the fact that this Government's international trade policy is influenced to a very large extent by a distinguished Russian-born intellectual and world planner whose name on the pay roll is Lewis L. Lorwin, but who also has used the name of Louis Levine as an author.

I understand that Dr. Lorwin's impressive title in the Department of Commerce is the economic adviser of the Office of International Trade. The OIT is being headed by an eminent New Dealer, Thomas C. Blaisdell, whose many governmental assignments have included economic adviser to Rex Tugwell during the days of land resettlement and association with that wizard of economics, Robert Roy Nathan, in the War Production Board.

Now, there is nothing mysterious about Dr. Lorwin's use of the alias, Louis Levine. You may pick up practically any volume of Who's Who in America for the past 20 years and find the name of Louis Levine, but for his biography you are referred to another page under the name of Lewis L. Lorwin.

It may not be important, but note that as Lorwin he spells his surname L-e-w-i-s, while as Levine he spells it L-o-u-i-s. It certainly would have been less confusing for his many readers of his extensive political and economics works and his lecture followings, not to mention his many committee colleagues and governmental associates, if he had made up his mind as to which way of spelling his surname he preferred. I would think he might sometimes get confused himself as to this Jekyll and Hyde sort of nomenclature he apparently adopted for himself for some inexplicable reason.

I have not had time to read through all the editions of Who's Who since 1926-27, but in that particular year, on page 1818, Lewis L. Lorwin is listed, but after his name it says, "See Louis Levine." So you look up Louis Levine on page 1183, and you find that his family name is given as Lewis Levitski Lorwin. Thereafter, later volumes of Who's Who read: "Levine, Louis, see Lewis L. Lorwin," with the exception of the current edition. The name Louis Levine is not listed in the 1946-47 edition but Lewis

L. Lorwin is listed in all his Marxist glory.

While all this Lorwin-Levine rigmarole may not be known even to Members of Congress who have had occasion to consult the Office of International Trade, I find that the Library of Congress is aware of the double identity of the scholar from Kiev.

Among the books in the Library of Congress which are attributed in Who's Who to Dr. Lorwin, or Levine if you prefer, there is one entitled, "The Taxation of Mines in Montana," published in New York in 1919 by B. W. Huebsch.

On the title page appears the following acknowledgment of authorship: "By Louis Levine, Ph. D., professor of economics, State University of Montana, author of 'The Labor Movement in France,' etc."

Some one, presumably an employee of the Library, has written in pencil at the top of the same page: "Lewis Levitski Lorwin." I note that here the spelling of the middle name carries a "z", making it "Levitski" and not "Levitski" with the "s" as sometimes appears. I call that to your attention only because you will realize how difficult it is to speak or write with absolute accuracy about a gentleman whose name takes on so many variations in spite of his international renown earned through diligent scholarship and study in Russia, France, Switzerland, and the United States, prolific writings that are international in scope, and honors that have been heaped upon him by the New Deal and internationalist groups.

When Dr. Lorwin went to Russia last summer on a mission for our Government, I wonder if he consistently used the Lewis L. Lorwin signature or some variations of it. He is such a busy man that just signing his name to all kinds of papers must be a chore, and I doubt that he bothers to use the technique of Who's Who in listing at least two names.

But after all, as Shakespeare said, "What's in a name?" I would like to give you a bit of history about Lorwin, or Levine as you prefer, from his biography in Who's Who which I assume he prepared or at any rate approved for publication.

He is described broadly as an economist and author. He was born near Kiev, Russia, on December 4, 1883. That would make him 64 years old today. He is the son of Jacob and Anna L. I do not know whether the "L" stands for Lorwin, Levine, or Levitski. He was educated in public schools in New York, private schools in Russia, Switzerland, and France. He got his Ph. D. from Columbia University in 1912. In the same year he married Rose Strunsky, Who's Who relates, but does not say whether she is the same person who was an active anarchist, belonging to an organization known as the League for Amnesty for Political Prisoners, headed by Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman.

Who's Who tells us that Lorwin, or Levine, if you prefer, came to the United States with his parents in 1887. That would have made him at that time a tender lad of 4 years.

We then find that he was an economic expert with the New York Department of Labor from 1912 to 1916; an instructor at Columbia University from 1914 to 1915; a lecturer at Wellesley College in 1916; an instructor, assistant professor, and finally professor of economics at the University of Montana from 1916 to 1919; a special writer on economic problems for the New York World, 1919-20; professor of economics and finance at Beloit College in Wisconsin, from 1920 to 1921; correspondent in Russia for the Chicago Daily News in 1921-22; member of the research staff of the Institute of Economics of Brookings Institution, 1925-33; economic adviser of the International Labor Office, Geneva, Switzerland, 1933-39; economic consultant, National Temporary Economic Committee; National Resources and Planning Board and Board of Economic Welfare, 1933-42.

Before going on with the biographical sketch, I wish to remind the Members of this body that the Board of Economic Warfare was Henry Wallace's old outfit. Once Henry got his hands on the learned doctor, it is not surprising that he should turn up later with Henry in the Department of Commerce. I wish to make it clear that Secretary Harriman did not hire Dr. Lorwin as his staff economist in the Office of International Trade. It certainly appears that Dr. Lorwin got himself placed in this key spot, paying around \$10,000 a year, with lots of expenses for travel and per diems, before Henry Wallace departed from the Department of Commerce in the wake of his shocking address before the Communists in New York's Madison Square Garden some months ago.

I also wish to point out that there was a reason for Dr. Lorwin, or Levine if you prefer, leaving the University of Montana in 1919 and going into newspaper work. It seems that his book, *Taxation of Mines in Montana*, brought about a crack-down because of some of the theories advocated by the distinguished economist, and he was not retained by the university after the furore caused by his book. I mention this fact because the episode may have had something to do with Louis Levine, as he was then known, deciding it would be more advantageous to him to popularize another name in educational circles. At any rate, *Who's Who* is authority for the fact that he subsequently preferred the name Lorwin, although he did not wish to lose any credit for writings produced under the name Levine. I might say that Dr. Lorwin in the bibliographies of his own books takes great pains to mention his own writings, and he himself lists both of his widely known names to keep the reader from being confused.

At this point I wish to proceed with the biography of Dr. Lorwin as given in *Who's Who*. He became economic adviser for the Foreign Economic Administration in 1943, and it was from FEA that he went to the Department of Commerce, I believe, along with so many others of Wallace's prodigies. I am sure you are familiar with the leftist Institute of Pacific Relations. Anyway, Dr. Lorwin was a delegate to the third I. P. R. at Kyoto in 1929, to the fifth at Banff in 1933, to the sixth at Yosemite National Park in 1936.

That is doing all right for a Russian immigrant boy from Kiev.

He lists memberships in the Institute of Pacific Relations, the American Economic Association, the National Economic and Social Planning Association, and notes that he founded the National Economic and Social Planning Association in 1934. I am not surprised at that because as early as 1925, he presided in Washington at a People's Lobby gathered for the consideration of Socialization of National Resources, Transportation and Banking. Apparently Dr. Lorwin has not been entirely happy with the American system of Government, for he seems to have devoted considerable energy and many years to trying to change it over to something resembling the system of his native Russia. I don't think that there can be any question in anyone's mind about that. In fact, Dr. Lorwin seems to be very proud of that fact, judging by all the data he compiled, or helped to compile, for *Who's Who*.

In that volume, we also note that he was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Economic and Planning Association from 1934 to 1938. He founded the Institute of World Economics in 1941, served as chairman of its board of trustees, and edited its publication, *World Economics*.

The Labor Movement in France, published in 1912, appears to be the book that started Dr. Lorwin, then Levine, on the road to literary fame. Its publication date coincides with his winning his Ph. D. from Columbia. Two years later, he published *Syndicalism in France*. Next came *Taxation of Mines in Montana* in 1919, with the unhappy results previously mentioned.

In 1924 he published the *Women's Garment Workers*, and so I assume he must have had some affiliations with the late Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, current head of the ILGWU.

By 1929, Dr. Lorwin was such an important figure that his book of that year, *Labor and Industrialism*, was translated into the French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. Advisory Economic Councils appeared in 1931. In 1933 he turned out a book on the American Federation of Labor. His 1937 output, the *World Textile Conference*, was translated into Spanish. In 1941, Dr. Lorwin really hit his stride with three books, the *Problem of Technological Unemployment*, the *Youth Work Programs*, and *Economic Consequences of Second World War*, which was translated into Swedish and Spanish.

In 1942 the prolific doctor authored *International Economic Development*, followed in 1943 by *Postwar Plans of the United Nations* and in 1945 by *Time for Planning*.

Dr. Lorwin also has been a coauthor of various writings, such as *ABC of the NRA* in 1934; *National Recovery Administration* in 1935; *Labor Relations Boards* in 1935, and so forth.

One wonders where Dr. Lorwin, now 64 years of age, could find the time and have the energy to do much more. But *Who's Who* tells us that he was director of reports on workers' nutrition and social policy, the world textile industry, the world coal industry, and so forth. These

documents were published between 1936 and 1939 by the International Labor Office in Geneva. He also has contributed to *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, the *Encyclopedia Americana*, the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *American Peoples Encyclopedia*, and magazines. He belongs to the Cosmos Club. He lives at the Marlyn Apartments, 3000 Thirty-ninth Street NW., when he is not globe trotting, off on a lecture tour, or attending the sessions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

If any Member of Congress wishes to examine further into Dr. Lorwin's writings, he may find a half-dozen treatises listed in the catalog of the National Archives as a part of the records of the National Resources Planning Board.

I would not wish any of you to miss the treat of reading there, *Public Works and Employment Planning in Germany, 1933-39*; *War-time Planning in Germany, 1939-40*; *National Planning in Latin-America*; *Stabilization of Planning in Sweden*; *International Economic Development, Public Works and Other Problems*; and *International Public Works and Economic Development*.

On May 14, 1933, Dr. Lorwin signed a petition to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt urging the recognition of Soviet Russia, one of the very first acts of the New Deal.

Probably due to his vast knowledge of Russia, our Government sent Dr. Lorwin to the Soviet Union last summer, but I am unable to find any report that he may have written on this trip, for which the United States shared his expenses with the Soviet Union. I understand that his travel expense to our Government was slightly over \$1,200, and I think Dr. Lorwin should have turned in some kind of report on conditions there in view of the fact that writing comes so easy to him and he is such an expert on international affairs.

Now there is something omitted, I am sure, from Dr. Lorwin's biography as published by *Who's Who*. The 1926-27 edition, on page 1183, tells us that Lorwin, then Levine, studied in Russia, France, and Switzerland between 1903 and 1906. One of his scholastic accomplishments was taking the gold medal at the Classical College at Cherkassi, Russia, during this period. But *Who's Who* does not mention what part, if any, Levine took in the Bolshevik uprising that broke out in Russia in 1905 and ended disastrously for the revolutionists early in 1907.

Now Leon Trotsky was in the United States in 1902, it can be shown, and he went back to Russia for the revolution in 1905. It is possible then that Trotsky, Levine, and Hillman could have hooked up somewhere over there in Lithuania or Russia during those bloody days.

Now the reason I have gone into this historical background of the Bolshevik uprising is that there is some evidence before Congress that Dr. Lorwin may actually have been mixed up in some way in the fracas in 1905 to 1907. During those years he would have been a vigorous young man of 22 to 24 years of age, even more vigorous than he is today at 64.

Congress has a record of a colloquy that took place in Dr. Lorwin's office between two of his associates, and it goes something like this:

First employee: "Dr. Lorwin is a very powerful person."

Second employee: "Why do you say Dr. Lorwin is so important?"

First employee: "Dr. Lorwin has been a lieutenant of Trotsky. He fled with Trotsky across hundreds of miles hiding out at night. Trotsky wanted Dr. Lorwin to go on with him, but Dr. Lorwin, after a conference with friends, came to America instead with Sidney Hillman."

There is also testimony before a congressional committee that Dr. Lorwin has been identified by a close associate as a Communist.

Now the reason I have brought this matter to the attention of this body is that the people of the United States are worried about communism here in Washington and throughout this Nation, and they want to know what President Truman and the Congress are going to do about communism at home, as well as in Greece, Turkey, Korea, and other far-away places.

It would seem to me that the administration would want to look into the career of Dr. Lorwin, alias Levine. But what do we find? The Department of Justice, Office of International Trade, apparently disturbed by the rumors that are flying around about their illustrious economist, got busy and found a safe and well-paid job abroad for the doctor that would last for a couple of years at least and required him to take his family with him. If it is true that Tom Blaisdell, Lorwin's chief, has ordered him to leave in the near future for London with his family, I think that Congress should get to the bottom of the circumstances that are involved, both with last summer's trip to Russia and the allegedly planned coming trip to London at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

It seems to me that this country is being embarrassed enough with Henry Wallace running around Europe blabbing without sending his old economist over there to London to further confuse the British people as to what the United States of America stands for.

The writings of Lorwin and the speeches of Henry Wallace sound so much alike in many respects that, in my opinion, there is something about this Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde that needs looking into and should be looked into quickly. I think the Congress should look into the whole personnel set-up of the Office of International Trade and raise the question as to why our Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was liquidated in favor of an Office of International Trade.

And while we are looking, we had better check to find how many relatives Dr. Lorwin has on the Government pay roll. He is reported to have at least two sons in strategic spots in top security agencies of our Government.

Dr. Levine also should be willing and eager to clear up the question as to who is the Louis Levine writing for the magazine *Soviet Russia Today*, and if there is any connection between Louis Levine of the Bronx, N. Y., and the Louis Levine

of the United States Department of Commerce. This should be easy to clear up if there are two Louis Levines writing about Russia and both of them were in Russia at the same time last summer, as claimed by the personnel department of the Department of Commerce.

It should be very simple for the State Department to produce passports issued to Lewis L. Lorwin and another passport issued to Louis Levine if both of these gentlemen were in Russia at the same time although on different missions. To date, the State Department has not appeared to be very cooperative in helping to straighten out the confusion which would naturally arise in view of the fact that Louis Levine was formerly the name of Lewis L. Lorwin, as I have taken the pains to convince this body this afternoon. If Dr. Lorwin wants to sue anybody for libel for calling him Louis Levine, I wonder why he has not brought suit against Who's Who during the past 20 years.

It all adds up to the same sort of confusion that has characterized just about every act of the New Deal during the past 14 years, and I, for one, want to see some of this confusion cleared up. Let us call a spade a spade, a Red a Red, and a Levine a Levine.

This case of Lorwin, or Levine, a highly paid and responsible executive in Government, is just one of a long list of cases in which there is an obvious smoke screen as to the ideological motivation of the individual.

President Truman, realizing that the elections of November 1946 represented a mandate from the American people to cleanse the Augean stables of Government of the communistic filth allowed to accumulate there during 14 years of New Deal control, issued a so-called "loyalty" directive to the heads of executive agencies and departments.

Obviously the President sought to steal the thunder from the Republicans who accepted this mandate from the people.

The President, however, so trickily worded his directive that the final move in eliminating any governmental employee of doubtful loyalty from his Government position continued to rest with the head of the agency or department of the executive branch of Government appointed by the President.

Representative EDWARD H. REESE, Kansas, chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, quickly spotted this hidden method of the President by which his own appointees would continue to be the Supreme Court of loyalty in any cases of personnel of the executive branch.

I believe with my distinguished colleague from Kansas that questions of loyalty should be determined by those agencies of Government whose activity throughout the years has been the compilation, verification, and retention in readiness for call, by authorized governmental authorities, of any and all cases of individuals infiltrated into Government whose primary loyalty is not to the Constitution and flag of the United States but to the flag and ideologies of any foreign government.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military and Naval Intelligence

Services, the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House, records of the United States Civil Service Commission Loyalty Board are the principal investigation agencies to which I refer.

I believe that all cases of personnel of questioned loyalty should be required to run the gamut of the files and records of these agencies. Where an adverse record is uncovered, heads of agencies and departments of the executive branch should be barred from accepting for employment in their departments such personnel until the individuals involved have been able to satisfactorily clear their records.

If ever in the history of these United States, there has ever been a time when our internal national security is so threatened, I do not know of it.

Every employee of the Federal Government is in effect a civilian soldier pledged to the defense of the United States of America, its Constitution, and its flag.

It is as vital that our civilian Government employees be loyal as it is for the members of our armed forces to be loyal.

I plead with the Members of this House to do everything within their individual powers to guarantee that only Americans be placed on guard.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is making a rather startling statement. What is the doctor going to do over there in England officially on our pay roll?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I imagine he is still going to work in the capacity of economic adviser.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS), from April 21 to April 28, on account of necessary absence from the city.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 22, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 214); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

587. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 194. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 239. A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 84. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 173. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Foreign Aid; without amendment (Rept. No. 299). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 874. An act to au-

thorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; without amendment (Rept. No. 297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, and the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3173. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3174. A bill to provide for the procurement of physicians and surgeons in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3175. A bill to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3176. A bill to permit individuals to deduct for income-tax purposes depreciation on their residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3177. A bill providing for compensation at the rate of \$5 per day for members of local boards under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGARVEY:

H. R. 3178. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942, so as to redefine the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3179. A bill to provide protection for Enlisted Reserve personnel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3180. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3181. A bill to grant certain veterans judicial review against the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3182. A bill to exempt from excise tax musical instruments sold to religious institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent

authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to provide that Federal public works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 195. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study reorganization and home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation placing residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning unemployment compensation and employment service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize payment of medical care rendered to recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3183. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3184. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3185. A bill for the relief of Nick Papademos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Alvin A. Baumer, doing business as the Baumer Foods Products Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son, W. Thomas Lockerman, Sudlersville Supply Co., George C. Moore & H. A. Moore, J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc., Hobbs & Jarman, and Royse R. Spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3188. A bill to provide for the advancement of James Edgar Davis on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Joe Parry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

368. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Niagara Falls Aerie, No. 88, Niagara Falls, N. Y., in opposition to an increase in postage rates on fraternal publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

369. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Avie D. Brown and citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, regarding S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

370. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Oak Island Lodge, No. 865, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Newark, N. J., opposing any change in the Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

371. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we in this place are weighed down by the problems of our Nation and of our world. Convict us of our share of personal responsibility for the situation in which we find ourselves. May we confess our part in creating our dilemmas, lest we feel no obligation to solve them. Help us to quit waiting for the other fellow to change his attitude and his ways, lest we never give Thee the chance for which Thou hast been waiting to change us.

This we ask in the lovely name of Him who came to change us all, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

As in legislative session, on request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 23, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; and

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	Malone	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced a bill to establish the Missouri Valley Authority. The Chair postponed reference of the bill until this noon. The Chair is prepared to rule. Does the Senator from Montana wish to be heard?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President. I am satisfied to accept the ruling of the Chair, because I am sure it will be based upon a correct interpretation of the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator.

Under a careful analysis of the bill, it seems quite evident to the Chair that there is only one place for the reference to be made. The Chair bases his decision particularly on the language on page 17 of the bill, where the general purpose of the proposed corporation is set forth, requiring the Missouri Valley Authority to make recommendations, including "a complete plan for the unified control and utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system, which will reconcile and harmonize the requirements for flood control, navigation, reclamation, agricultural purposes, power, recreational, and other needs," and so forth.

The bill could be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if the single reference to agricultural purposes were considered to be controlling. It could be referred to the Committee on Public Lands if the reference to irrigation were controlling. But it seems to the Chair that clearly the overriding purpose of the bill deals with flood control, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and navigation, and, under the circumstances, it seems very clear to the Chair that under the terms of the Reorganization Act the bill must be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the able Presiding Officer for the study he has given the matter. I had hoped that it would go to the Public Lands Committee. All I wish, and all I have a right to expect, is a full, fair, and impartial hearing on the bill. I consider it a very important legislative proposal, vital to the welfare of our country. It will implement the policy adopted by the Congress in the full-employment bill. I wish to express the hope that the Committee on Public Works will give the bill the full and impartial hearing to which it is entitled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Alfredo Garofolo from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on January 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.